

JANUARY, 1887.

# The Congregational Review

IN WHICH ARE INCORPORATED

The Congregationalist and British Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY THE

REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS, B.A.

---

## CONTENTS.

1. PRESENT-DAY CONGREGATIONALISM.
2. THE OLD ANTINOMIANISM AND THE NEW. By R. W. DALE.
3. THE COMMANDED BLESSING. By P. GRANT.
4. BYGONE DAYS IN BEDFORDSHIRE. By JOHN BROWN.
5. LORD SELBORNE ON DISESTABLISHMENT.
6. CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY. By E. R. CONDER.
7. THE ROCK TOMBS OF THEBES, AND THE SEPULCHRE OF MOSES.  
By A. D. PHILPS.
8. HOW BLIND CHINESE BEGGARS MAY BE TRANSFORMED INTO  
MISSIONARY SCRIPTURE READERS.
9. LORD SHAFTESBURY'S BIOGRAPHY.
10. IS LIBERAL RE-UNION POSSIBLE?
11. EDITORIAL NOTES.
12. THE EDITOR'S LIBRARY TABLE.
13. CURRENT LITERATURE.

---

London:

T. FISHER UNWIN,

26, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

[One Shilling.]

[Monthly.]

# The Congregational Review.

## NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

All Orders or Communications in reference to Advertisements, also Remittances for the insertion of Advertisements, must be sent direct to MESSRS. REYNELL AND SON, General Advertising Agents, No. 44, Chancery Lane, London, W.C., and not to the Publisher or Editor.

### TERMS:—

For Cover and Facing Matter.						
One Page	...	...	...	...	...	£4 0 0
Half „	...	...	...	...	...	2 5 0
Quarter Page	...	...	...	...	...	1 5 0
For Ordinary Positions.						
One Page	...	...	...	...	...	£3 0 0
Half „	...	...	...	...	...	1 15 0
Quarter Page	...	...	...	...	...	1 0 0
One-Eighth „	...	...	...	...	...	0 12 6

Bills, not exceeding 4pp., £2 2s. 0d. for the edition. A Reduction on Series.

Advertisements for the next issue must be sent before January 15.

## COOK'S TOURS TO EGYPT, THE NILE, AND PALESTINE,

Visiting Alexandria, Cairo, Jerusalem, Nazareth, Damascus, &c. ; leaving London at fixed date. Independent Tours at any time.

*Programme, with Maps, 6d.*

## THOS. COOK AND SON,

Ludgate Circus; 99, Gracechurch Street; 35, Piccadilly; 445, West Strand, London.

## WATFORD—FAIRFIELD HOUSE.

MISS SELL, having succeeded to the School so long carried on by MRS. J. WATSON WALKER, continues to receive Young Ladies as Resident Pupils. A Christian Home, Modern Education, Masters, and a French Governess. Pupils prepared for the Public Examinations when required. Terms Moderate. References to Parents of Pupils.

## INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, TAUNTON.

REV. F. WILKINS AVELING, M.A., B.Sc., PRINCIPAL, assisted by several qualified Masters. Pupils prepared for Cambridge Local Examinations, for Civil Service, for entrance to any University, for their degree at London, and for Commercial life. Splendid gymnasium, swimming bath, &c. Separate JUNIOR SCHOOL under care of MRS. MILNE. PRIVATE STUDIES for the elder students. Board and education from 27 to 39 guineas a year. For particulars apply to Principal, or Secretary, Mr. Albert Goodman, Taunton.

e  
l  
r

2.

°.

a.

N  
e.  
ic

d.  
or  
d/  
r.





# The Congregational Review.

JANUARY, 1887.

## PRESENT-DAY CONGREGATIONALISM.

WE enter upon our work at what may be regarded as a critical period in the history of Congregationalism. This may sound strange to those who see on every side evidences of the vitality and power of our Churches. We certainly should be the last to ignore these signs, or to underrate their importance. Congregationalism had never a wider sphere to occupy, or was more intent on occupying it wisely. It is instinct with that aggressive spirit against the kingdom of darkness which, happily, is abroad in all Churches—the spirit which cannot rest satisfied without continual growth, and which is eager—sometimes perhaps too eager—to adopt any method which promises to secure great results. There was never in it less of the proselytizing temper, at the root of which is a belief, more or less distinctly formed, that the Church of Christ is co-terminous with one particular denomination. Or, to phrase it somewhat differently, never was there less disposition to engage in a struggle for the points which divide Congregationalists from other Christians; or a more intense desire to make Congregationalism a mighty power for Christ. Our Churches are alive with a keen sense of their responsibilities, and an anxious desire to discharge them. Among them are timid and conservative spirits, who are alarmed about every departure from the old routine, and laggards whom it is hard to rouse to resolution and effort. But as

much might be said of every great community, and at all times. When all deductions of this kind have been made, it remains true that the Congregationalism of to-day, as represented by those who are in hearty sympathy with its principles and aims, is full of that strong faith, that lofty purpose, and those noble ambitions which are characteristic of vigorous life. Its loyal sons never doubt that it has before it a glorious future, and they spare no effort to realize their anticipations.

It is nevertheless true that there are circumstances which make the present a time for anxious watchfulness. It might almost seem as though we were at the "parting of the ways," and that the future must largely depend on our loyalty and fidelity at the present. We have secured for ourselves great opportunities, or rather the courage and zeal of our fathers have secured them for us; and the question which presents itself with ever increasing urgency, is whether we are able so to use them as to prove ourselves men with understanding of the signs of the times? By long and anxious struggle Congregationalism has won for itself a place, not altogether without honour, among the spiritual forces which are at work for the evangelization of England; and it has to justify its right to the position by faithful testimony and consecrated service. It has a distinctive truth to teach; and if we were asked to define it briefly, we should say that it is the simplicity that is in Christ. To separate the vital truth of the gospel from the additions, and still more from the corruptions of human creeds; to insist on faith in the living Christ as the one essential condition of Christian life and Church fellowship; to show how perfect liberty may be combined with the most devoted loyalty to the Lord—these are the lessons it has to inculcate, and which it seems specially fitted to inculcate. It is bound by no formulated creed; but faith in Christ dwelling in the heart of all who believe in Him is essential to its very existence. Are there not conditions of society around us which warrant the hope that, if we are faithful to our trust, we may be able to exert an influence impossible to those who are fettered by the defence of a formal orthodoxy?

The age is marked by a strange intellectual unrest. There is in it a strong sceptical element; but to treat it as wholly sceptical would be to mistake its real character and ignore some of its most conspicuous phenomena. There is, in truth, as passionate an eagerness in the adoption of some new fancy or vagary as there is a fierce repudiation of some principle hitherto accepted as truth. If the spirit which is so prevalent has an evil side, it certainly is not without some counteractive. The scientific temper may sometimes be associated with an offensive arrogance of tone, and may intrude itself into regions which lie outside its dominion. Its action must always be most offensive to all whose creeds include a multitude of traditional opinions, the exact value of which they have never been careful to measure even for themselves. But it is nevertheless an invaluable force to all who are able to understand and use it. Its very essence is simple loyalty to truth. It is often mistaken as to the tests which it would apply in relation especially to religious principles; but in its endeavour to shake off the evil influence of superstition, or prejudice, or popular opinion, and get at facts, and in its resolution to hold fast by them at whatever cost, it is carrying out the very principles of Christianity itself. Its scorn of authority, its faith in progress, its openness of mind, its readiness to give hospitable welcome to all new principles which can justify their right to acceptance, are all valuable elements. What are they, indeed, but the embodiment of the apostle's exhortation to "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good"? No doubt they are all capable of abuse, and so is everything good; but the possible, even real, and perhaps frequent, abuse must not make us insensible to their value, still less induce us to regard them in a spirit of hostility, which would be as impolitic as it would be unjust.

There is, if our faithless hearts could only understand and accept it, more of a truly religious spirit, and more that would justify hope as to the future in the discontent of inquiring spirits, unpleasant as are some of its manifestations, than in the formal submission of a heartless

indifference which hardly thinks it worth while to inquire or doubt, which possibly may even maintain an outward show of deference for beliefs which it has never taken the trouble to examine, but which hardly affects to have an interest in the gospel to which it yields a languid and inoperative assent. There may be more apparent hostility on the part of unbelievers, there certainly is more of aggressiveness, and with it more of the turmoil and agitation of strife ; but it may be doubted whether there is more of real alienation from the spirit and power of the gospel now than might have been found in a generation in which there was less of avowed scepticism. Protestants, and especially Congregationalists, should be the very last to regard with anxiety or distrust any awakening from a formalism which is really spiritual death, even though the first manifestations of the change be of an unwelcome nature. They are not slaves of authority ; they exist in virtue of the right of free thought, and they attach no value to any profession except that of the man to whose conscience the truth has commended itself. It is not for them to become pessimists because around them are disquiet and debate. They have the firm assurance that whatever of Divine truth there is in their systems and creeds cannot be shaken, and they have no desire to preserve anything beside.

A curious account of the present state of the English mind is given by the journal which used to represent a kind of philosophic Liberalism, but whose Unionism has all but strangled its Liberalism, and has gone far even to disturb its philosophic temper.

Few observers who are both keen and cool doubt the existence in Englishmen of this generation of a certain inner weakness which frequently paralyses their action, or deny that it springs from an all-pervading doubt or hesitation. The English-directing classes are not quite sure any longer of their conviction upon any subject, are not clear that they have the right to conquer, or to coerce, or to repress, or to govern, or to spend their own money, or to enforce dues, or, in fact, to do anything, except, indeed, to levy taxes, and Mr. Auberon Herbert is openly suspicious even about that. On the other hand, they are not sure, with any steadfast sureness, that they have not these

rights, and consequently do these things spasmodically, or, to be more precise, condone them readily when they are done for them and when they profit by the result.

The diagnosis of the spirit of the age is eminently suggestive. The journalist is looking at it from the political standpoint, but it has its theological and religious side also. This becomes even more manifest when we look at these remarks in their connection. They are introduced to point the contrast between this prevalent tendency in society and the growth of what the writer calls a "new fanaticism"—in other words, a passionate enthusiasm for Home Rule in Ireland, inspired by the belief that it is right. This seems to us eminently characteristic of the age. Many would describe it, and not wholly without reason, as an age of unbelief, yet, strange to say, we have in it one of the most curious religious excitements which has been seen for many a day, and it has commanded an amount of sympathy which seems wholly inconsistent with the dominant temper of the times. The Salvation Army seems the natural product of what are called the "ages of faith." It puts practical contempt upon intelligence; disparages the kind of influence to which Christian Churches are accustomed; uses excitement, and excitement often of a very rude kind, as its favourite weapon; coerces men by a discipline which in its autocratic temper and severe restrictions resembles nothing so much as the Order of the Jesuits. Had such a movement sprung up at the end of the sixteenth century it would have seemed natural, but it is here among us in the nineteenth; and it finds patrons and supporters, apologists, if not eulogists, in the most unlikely quarters. We will not even attempt to inquire into the philosophy of this. We note it only as a fact, and a fact that is not without its encouragement. It may be an emphatic reminder that the one thing which the world wants to-day is reality. Churches that are walking in a vain show, and content with it, have evil times before them. Systems and creeds must prove their right to live by doing a work which shows that they are worth preserving. Is this not much the same phenomenon which the journalist notes

in the political world? Why is it that Englishmen are "not clear that they have the right to conquer, or to coerce, or to repress?" It certainly is not for the lack of teachers who try to persuade them, or, indeed, to assure them of it as an eternal truth, which is beyond dispute, that the one duty of England is to consult her own interests, and that the one way of promoting the happiness of other peoples is to impose on them English ideas. But there is a widespread rebellion against such pleas, specious though they may be. Men want to get below these shams of prestige and national glory, and to get at the realities of truth and justice. The same thing is happening in the sphere of religion. There is a hunger for truth, reality, spiritual power, much keener and more extended than superficial symptoms would indicate. It is for us to try and appease its cravings. Its very intensity lays it open to mistakes and deceptions. But the only way in which its errors can be corrected and its demands supplied is by our taking care that it has the bread of life.

There is more reason to be solicitous about the unbelief of Christians than about the contradictions of sinners, who reject and even oppose the truth. This may seem a hard saying, but the more it is examined the more complete will be its justification. The measure of our power to affect the world will always be our own faith in the gospel itself, and that will be determined by the extent to which it possesses our own souls. Unfortunately, this is the very opposite of the view taken by many. They are extremely careful about the "form of sound words," but there, too often, their solicitude ends. That there are a multitude of beliefs professed but not obeyed, held but not realized, does not seem to trouble them at all. A creed is with them a series of propositions, held together by a logical nexus, and forming one organic whole, each one of whose component parts must be jealously guarded against disturbance. Their orthodoxy is a chain close and compact—

"And from that chain, whatever link you strike,  
Tenth or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike"—

Hence they note with undisguised alarm any invasion of their accepted ideas, however slight it may seem to be in itself, as implying a menace to the whole fabric of orthodoxy. They would preserve, not only doctrines, but even the mould in which they have been cast. Nor, indeed, do they stop with doctrines. He who would be orthodox must accept not only the dogma, but the arguments by which it is sustained, and the interpretations of Scripture on which it is supposed to rest. Who has not met worthy people who have been very much shocked by some doubt cast, say, upon their favourite theory of types, or, perhaps, upon the typical character of one or other of the great Old Testament worthies? There are men, even to this day, who would look very doubtfully on any one who ventured to broach any of the favourite ideas of the "higher criticism," such, for example, as the existence of a second Isaiah. They never pause to consider whether any theory on such points touches the vital truth of the gospel; it is enough that it is contrary to the notions which are esteemed orthodox. Or, if they argue at all, they support their view by a theory of constructive heresy, which is as unsatisfactory, and is apt to become as oppressive in its bearings, as that of constructive treason—the favourite instrument of the tyrant who has to maintain, at least, the semblance of respect for law.

To some all this may seem a sign of strong faith. It is in truth the very opposite. It betrays so faint a confidence in the gospel itself, that there is a fear of disturbing any ideas which have been associated with it, lest perchance in disturbing them we should undermine the very foundations of the truth itself. What we need is to get back to the simplicity that is in Christ. The apostles preached Christ. We have in the Epistles the outline of other doctrines, but even in them they are not set forth in any systematic form, and these Epistles, it must always be remembered, were letters to Christian Churches, not discourses to congregations of unbelievers. In preaching to them, Paul and his fellows preached Christ crucified, and in doing so we may be sure they were very careful to eschew the



mere wisdom of words, and not to encumber their message with subtle speculations of philosophy, or ingenious theories. The days of creed-building had not come. It was the age of evangelizing, and it is to that we must strive to get back. Happily the tendency of the times is all in that direction, and it will be our business in this Review, as far as lies in our power to strengthen it. We have a Conservatism, a Conservatism that will ever be watchful and jealous, but it extends only to that gospel which Paul preached, that Christ Jesus died for our sins, and that He rose again. We do not profess indifference to other related truths, but this is what we recognize as the one basis of Christian fellowship. Systems of theology or systems of Church polity, are valuable just in so far as they help to the clearer and simpler manifestation of "Christ crucified." On their comparative merits in this respect there will always be differences of opinion, and we should contend for our own as stoutly as any others, but while doing so, we love as brethren all who call Jesus Saviour and Lord.

We define our own position as Broad Evangelical, and our desire is that this should describe both the matter and spirit of our teaching. There is always evil in the separation of these two. If the substance of Evangelical doctrine be not carefully preserved, then liberty may become nothing more than a mere revolt against every form of opinion. If, on the other hand, too much stress be laid upon doctrine, there may be engendered a narrowness of spirit, or an unsympathetic temper, or, what is worse than all, a disposition to regard faith as a mere belief in propositions rather than trust in a living Person. The more closely we cleave to Christ Himself, the more may we hope to catch of that spirit which breathed throughout His whole ministry; the spirit which made Him so gentle and gracious in all His dealings with every honest searcher after truth; which caused Him to handle with such tenderness the difficulties of a Pharisee like Nicodemus, overpowered by the wonders of a region of spiritual truth, altogether unfamiliar to his respectable religionism; which filled Him only with compassion for the young man whose love of the world was enticing



him away from Himself; and which revealed itself in the loving and gracious sympathy with which he answered those questionings of Thomas which to the hard formalists of all times would have seemed little short of impiety.

One mischievous result of the human additions with which the simple truth is too often encumbered and obscured has been a violent reaction, sometimes so extreme that it degenerates into a blind Iconoclasm which will glory in the wholesale destruction it works, and will never rest until it has left us without a creed at all. Infinitely worse than the tendency to disparage particular systems or reject doctrines which have hitherto been regarded as of the essence of the gospel, is the disposition to treat even the most precious truths—the Atonement of Christ, the work of the Spirit in the heart of man, the authority of Scripture, it may be even the being of God—as “open questions,” with the underlying suggestion, that the conclusion formed upon them does not matter. The life, it is said, and with some qualification the statement may be accepted, is everything, and it is quietly insinuated, as though the one assertion were the necessary inference from the other, that the creed is nothing. This hasty inference, however, does not cut the tie which connects creed and conduct. Despite all the eloquent declamation against dogmas, men are so far affected by their beliefs that those which do not affect them are not worth calling beliefs at all. The apostolic saying, “If a man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His,” is not more true than its converse, “If a man have the Spirit of Christ he must be His.” But then comes the question, why should a man cultivate that spirit if he have no faith in Christ Himself?

Dr. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, in his preface to a recent volume of sermons, says, with a discrimination which is as rare as it is invaluable:

It is confidently and sometimes plaintively asserted that there is such a thing as “the new theology,” otherwise we might not have discovered any fact more serious than this, that there are sundry theological writers more or less diverging from each other and their predecessors,

certainly no novel phenomenon, but one common to every Anno Domini of all the eighteen hundred. If any one should compute the result out of these diverging forces at any given period, I suppose that would be "the new theology" for that time. If it should appear from such computation that "the new theology" of our time consists mainly in these three tendencies: (1) To concentrate study upon the life and person of Jesus Christ; (2) To accept with a docile mind the teaching of the Bible concerning itself; (3) To subordinate sectarian and provincial theologies to the fellowship of belief in the Church universal,—then I would gladly count myself on the side of the new theology, or count the new theology on my side.

So say we. Insisting on the simplicity of Christ, we shall get nearer to the primitive model, and we shall find also the surest basis for that catholic temper, to whose growth, rather than to any elaborate plans for outward reconciliation, the amalgamation of Churches, or the organization of a great visible Church, we must look for the true reunion of Christendom. Too often has the Holy Catholic Church, or the orthodox creed, or a favourite Church system, taken the place of Christ, and we may gladly welcome any voice which reminds us that Christianity is Christ Himself. It is hardly necessary in these days to plead for liberty. The struggle which has been waged in order to secure it has been long and arduous, but it has been successful; and the peril of the hour is that in some cases the victory may be abused. We have neither right nor desire to impose fetters upon any man's thought or conscience. By all means let us cultivate a spirit of the most enlightened tolerance, and even when we feel constrained to point out what we hold to be an error, we would meet it with argument and persuasion rather than denunciation or anathema. Anathemas, in truth, have never benefited any Church or any cause, and their employment is a sign of unbelief and not of faith. But there is a loyalty which we owe to our Master which we can never consent to compromise. We know nothing of a Christianity in which Christ is not the Saviour and Lord. We are not content to resolve faith in Him into a dreamy sentiment, which can give no rational account of itself, and which exercises no living influence over the life and

the character. Still less can we regard homage to the great Teacher of Nazareth as equivalent to a trust in the living Redeemer. The Congregationalism which we love is more than a mere negation and protest. It is the proclamation of a great truth that the Church is a society of those who trust and love the Lord Jesus Christ, and own Him as their only Head.

---

### THE OLD ANTINOMIANISM AND THE NEW.

THE Revisers of the New Testament have made a felicitous change in the translation of 1 John iii. 4. We used to read, "Sin is the transgression of the law"—which is true; but what John wrote passes beyond the definite act, and reaches the principle and essence of sin. The new reading represents his thought more accurately than the old—"Sin is lawlessness," a want of reverence for authority, an impatience of restraint, the temper of revolt.

There is a form of Christian theology in which this "lawlessness" has been sanctioned and consecrated. Three great truths have been made the ground of a theoretical and doctrinal defence of man's reluctance to submit to any superior authority. Calvin's doctrine that all the blessings of salvation, in this world and the next, come to us from the free and eternal love of God; Luther's doctrine of Justification by Faith; the doctrine of the great mystics of all churches that saintly men are one with Christ;—from these great truths, conceived in unspiritual forms, a mechanical logic has drawn deductions, which have been wrought into the theological system known as Antinomianism; and Antinomianism is another name for hostility to law, "lawlessness." Antinomian theologians taught that, in the eternal counsels of God and by an irresistible decree, the elect were predestined to eternal salvation, irrespective of their faith and of their personal righteousness. They said that the sins of the elect were not merely imputed to Christ, in the sense that He suffered for them, or that He was charged

with them, and treated by God as if He had committed them; but that He is so completely one with the elect, that their sins are really His. Christ is the greatest of transgressors, and therefore He endured the wrath of God. The elect, on the other hand, by the Divine decree, are so completely one with Christ, that His righteousness is really theirs—theirs, no matter what the enormity of their sins. They may lie and steal; they may commit the grossest sensual vices; they may blaspheme God and hate mankind; but God can see no sin in them. For them the law is abolished.

These monstrous opinions were maintained by some of the sects which, in the seventeenth century, broke out into wild revolt against the traditional theology, as soon as the strong hand of the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts was paralyzed by the victories of the Parliament; and they contributed to the terror with which the Presbyterians regarded the Independent demand for an unlimited toleration. A certain measure of sanction was given to them in their less extravagant forms by men of some eminence like Dr. Crisp. They survived the Restoration. Soon after the Revolution of 1688, the republication of the works of Dr. Crisp, with the addition of some previously unpublished sermons, occasioned fierce controversy and widened the differences between the two great denominations of Nonconformists. Antinomian opinions were not wholly extinguished during the last century. Here and there, even in great towns, there are still some obscure congregations which are supposed to cling to doctrines that lie dangerously near the borders of Antinomianism. In the rural districts of the southern counties of England, such congregations are said to be much more numerous.

It is not to be supposed that preachers who, in their audacious statement of the extreme conclusions of Calvinism, approach the Antinomian heresy, always present their creed in forms which provoke moral resentment. I can just remember one or two eminent men of that school in London, whose preaching had a great charm for excellent Christian people. They were men of the purest character

and the most devout spirit, and their hearts were full of tender and passionate love for Christ. They preached constantly on the grace of God and the blessedness of saints; and they were what are called "experimental" preachers. They did not deny the broad distinction between right and wrong; nor did they deny the holy authority of God. But, as far as the elect were concerned, they always represented that authority as *unarmed*; for them it had no resources of terror; their sins were menaced by no penalties; the worst sins could not imperil their final salvation; nor did their sins affect their present relations to God, for God sees no sin in His chosen.

Among the grosser sort of men it is easy to see what infinite mischief was certain to come from teaching of this kind. They thought that it left them free to indulge in all their vices without any danger of incurring the Divine wrath or "the second death." When they were once assured of their election to eternal life, no sins, however flagrant, could ruin them. The Divine decree which destined them to eternal righteousness and glory was certain to be fulfilled:—Was not the Grace of God mightier than all the powers of evil? When censured for their vices they sometimes dared to use the great words of Paul—"It is not I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me;" and since they were in Christ, they contended that His righteousness was theirs. Even among good people who did not abuse it to licentious purposes this teaching produced a relaxation of moral fibre, and conscience was enfeebled. God ceased to be august in His moral sovereignty, and reverence in worship gave place to presumptuous familiarity and profane freedom. But it was wonderfully popular, and the truths underlying it gave it, as I have said, a charm for some excellent people. I remember one who was instinctively afraid to listen to it too frequently, but who occasionally "snatched a fearful joy," and found it delightful.

We look back upon this kind of theology with scorn and with amazement. That Christ was the greatest of transgressors, and that the Elect are so completely one with Christ that God can see no sin in them, are propositions

which seem to us so intolerable, that we are disposed to think that men must have been delirious to listen to them without abhorrence. Antinomianism, except in some obscure corners of the world, is, as we imagine, dead and rotten, and is not likely to trouble mankind any more.

Rotten—yes; like good fruit, over-ripe. But dead—no. I wish it were. In other intellectual forms, relying on other assumptions, vindicating itself by appeals to other elements of human nature, it is one of the most energetic forces in the religious life of our times. There has been a recrudescence of the old heresy. The same “lawlessness” which was sanctioned by the Antinomian theology is sanctioned by a theology which would claim to be the precise antithesis of Antinomianism—a theology which is more attractive in England to-day than Antinomianism ever was, even in its palmiest prosperity. We have a new Antinomianism which is quite as fatal to the perfect life as the old.

The old Antinomians insisted on the Divine grace—on the Divine grace always, on the Divine grace only. What they said was true, gloriously true; but by saying nothing else they made it dangerously false. It is the same with the new Antinomians. They tell us that God loves man, loves every man, the good and the bad, the pure and the impure, the just and the unjust, the thief and the honest man, the saint and the sinner. What they tell us is also true, gloriously true; but by saying nothing else they make it dangerously false. The old Antinomians said that God has destined the elect to eternal glory, irrespective of their faith and their conduct; the new say that God has destined all men to eternal glory, irrespective of their faith and their conduct. According to this gospel the gate is wide and the way broad that “leadeth unto life,” and all men are walking in it. No man need strive to enter by this “gate”: every man has entered by it already; and no matter how he may strive to escape from this “way,” to escape from it is impossible. It is the only “way” in which any man can walk; for there is no way that “leadeth unto destruction.”

The difference between the old doctrine and the new is an arithmetical, not a moral difference. The old insisted that the elect are few; the new insists that the whole race are pre-destined to "glory, honour, and immortality;" both insist that no antagonism to the Divine authority, no insensibility to the Divine love, can prevent the eternal decree from being accomplished. The new Antinomians, like the old, believe that "the elect will be saved do what they may."

Neither the old Antinomians nor the new have been able to disregard the sufferings which follow—though in this world they do not universally and uniformly follow—wrong-doing. But a phrase which has been used to describe the old Antinomian theory of the connection between sin and suffering, in the case of the elect, might also be used to describe the theory of the new Antinomians concerning the connection between sin and suffering in the case of all men—men "suffer *from* their sins, not *for* them." According to this theory, God does not punish men, but in the nature of things, or according to the settled order of the universe, wrong-doing very commonly brings loss, trouble, and pain.

Law, in its lower sense, is acknowledged; and the new Antinomians give it a very large place in their conception of the universe. Law, in its higher sense, as a rule of conduct enforced by a Personal Will, is resented. But to acknowledge what are usually called the Laws of Nature implies no moral submission to an authority above ourselves; they are laws given to Nature, not to us. We find out what they are, and use our knowledge of them to get our own way and to work our own will. We are compelled to observe them in the *methods* by which we seek our ends; but in the choice of our *ends* they leave us free. The moral laws of God are of a different kind; they direct us, not merely in the methods by which we have to secure ends of our own choosing, but in the choice of the ends of life. They assert the supremacy of a Will which is above our own. They tell us that God is not only a God of infinite love, but that He, Personally, is the Lord and

Sovereign of life, and that He insists on our obedience. This, to many men, is intolerable.

It may, indeed, be contended that, in one respect, the new Antinomianism has made a great advance on the old; for it affirms with intense earnestness the continuity of the present and the future life. It declines to acknowledge any artificial boundary between this world and the next. It warns men that whatever evil consequences follow sin, according to the structural laws of man's moral and spiritual nature, are not arrested by death. Remorse, and the deterioration of the moral and spiritual fibre, the degradation of the moral and spiritual life—these are the certain effects of wrong-doing; and they cannot be escaped, either in this world or the world to come, except by repentance and amendment.

But these structural laws of our moral and spiritual nature are of the same kind as the structural laws of our physical nature; they are impersonal; they execute themselves. What conscience requires is the strong support of a Supreme Personal Will, enforcing righteousness; and where the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ and of the apostles is frankly received this support is given. Men are not left to order their life according to an ideal law; the ideal law is expressed and asserted in the Will of the Personal God; and to keep the law men have to obey Him. Nor are they simply told that by the settled order of the universe and the constitution of their own moral and spiritual nature certain evil results will follow sin, and certain good results follow righteousness; the supreme terror is the "indignation" and the "wrath" of the Living God, and the supreme reward is the personal joy of God in their fidelity and righteousness.

But the whole tendency of modern times is unfriendly to submission to moral authority. The spirit of "lawlessness" is active throughout the whole range of our thought and in every region of our life. Authority in the Family, authority in the organization of Society, authority in the Church, authority in the State—there is a general revolt against them all. This revolt is to be attributed partly to the



illegitimate extension of the claims of authorities which have secure foundations in the order of the world ; partly to the weakness with which, in consequence of the decay of faith, their just claims are asserted ; partly to the pretensions of authorities which are wholly illegitimate. But, whatever its origin or justification, it has become a revolt against all authority, just or unjust, human or divine. To great numbers of men there is nothing that commands reverence or imposes restraint ; and they regard freedom from all control as the chief blessedness of man. We have forgotten the nobler temper and nobler aims of those who in earlier times fought and suffered for liberty. They resisted the tyranny of Churches and States, not because they were impatient of authority, but because they had an awful reverence for the authority of God. They disobeyed inferior powers that they might be free to obey Him. They were not "lawless," but were resolved at all costs to obey the laws of the eternal kingdom. The spirit of obedience was the inspiration of their revolt.

We shall do well to watch and check the lawlessness which is encouraged by the influences which surround us ; for our religion, in its creed and in its temper, is affected by whatever affects our moral habits and our moral life. According to the natural order, the Family, Society, the Church, the State, should discipline men to habits of reverence and submission, and hence those who are compelled to resist the traditions of churches and to attempt reforms in the State, need special grace to prevent them from breaking loose from all restraints and from coming to disregard the authority of God Himself. Times of revolution, whether religious or political, always encourage Antinomianism.

But is not love "the fulfilment of the Law"? No doubt. Its *fulfilment*, not its *abolition*. Perfect love for God does not disregard His authority, but rejoices in it. His "statutes" become "songs" instead of unwelcome restraints ; all the currents of life flow freely in the channels defined by His will. But His "statutes" are His "statutes" still ; they are not counsels merely, they

are laws ; but laws which love has no desire to break. God's moral sovereignty is one of the prerogatives of His Divinity. When I call Him my God, I mean that His will—not my own—is the rule of life and conduct. When I say that He is God over all, I mean that the final harmony and glory of the universe are to come from the acceptance of His will as the supreme law by all created beings ; and, for myself, I also mean that whoever resists and refuses to submit—be he man or angel—must perish.

*Birmingham.*

R. W. DALE.

### THE COMMANDED BLESSING.

“ There the LORD commanded the blessing, even life for evermore.”—  
PSALM cxxxiii. 3.

“ So thou art under orders ! He who spake,  
And at whose word light brake  
Upon the world, hath bidden thee *to be* ;  
And thou art no more free  
To vanish, or expire, but must abide  
The changing time and tide.  
But, yet, I see thee not, and cannot find ;—  
It may be I am blind.  
O Life for evermore,” I said, “ Reveal  
Thyself. No more conceal  
Thine excellence, but show to me thy grace,  
And thy fair dwelling-place,  
And let me know if thou be true to trust.  
The verdict of the dust  
Is not for thee. The change and the decay,  
I see from day to day,  
Say thou art not. The flying years declare  
Thou dost not truly bear  
Thy part. The living things, my eyes behold,  
Thou dost but touch in cold  
And formal way, that they may live and die.  
And, too, the prophet's cry  
I hear, and I believe—‘ All flesh is grass :  
The people fade and pass.’  
Yet, I would hope in thy reality,  
And thy fidelity.  
For, well I know that, without thee, I fail,  
Since death o'er nature doth prevail.”

And then I heard : " Fear not : or, only fear  
 Thyself may prove untrue.  
 I AM. I live : and, once within my sphere,  
 All things for ever new  
 Become. If thou, thyself, art true to trust  
 Fear not, I live in thee !  
 The path of shining light, where walk the just,  
 Leads unto liberty  
 Of perfect light and life. Thou, walking there,  
 Shalt find me ever home ;  
 And, though the landscapes be not always fair ;  
 And, though there be some gloam  
 To hinder thy far sight, it shall be well  
 With thee, within, where I  
 And thou, in harmony, together dwell.  
 And thou, too, shalt espy  
 From our tent-door, when shines the morning sun,  
 The far-off land, where reigns,  
 In all the glory of His grace, that One  
 Who, by His life of pains,  
 And death of woe, and resurrection power,  
 Hath given life to thee.  
 Glimpses thine eyes shall have ; and, some fair hour,  
 Thy spirit shall be free,  
 To see, in all His beauty, the Great King.  
 For, those who live with me,  
 And walk in light, He doth to glory bring,  
 To live eternally.  
 But, oh, be true to trust ! To me be true !  
*That is thy special chart ;*  
 And *this* the work that I will have thee do :—  
 Love God with all thy heart ;  
 And love the Christ, who all thy sorrows bore ;  
 For loving Him *is* LIFE FOR EVERMORE."

I answered not, for I had nought to say.  
 I could but bow my head and, grateful, pray.

P. GRANT.

## BYGONE DAYS IN BEDFORDSHIRE.

### I. THE PRIOR OF DUNSTABLE AND THE BURGESSES.

PASSING with anything like serious intent along one of the main "ridings" of a Bedfordshire wood, one is under con-

stant temptation to check "those finer spirits that," as Wordsworth tells us, "refuse to flow when purposes are lightly changed." For the dell on this side or the glade on that seems so inviting with feathery fern and fragrant pine, and so pleasant is it to linger among the branching hazels and commune with the spirit of the woods, that if one does resolutely go on it is with the pleasant promise, inwardly made, that we will come again some other day and wander at our own sweet will.

Not unlike this is the experience of one who searches in old libraries or State archives, among the faded records of the past. There are by-nooks of history as there are by-paths in the woods it is not easy to pass. Curious documents turn up by the way, aside from one's main purpose, which one would like to turn back to again; and old-world stories are found in unexpected places, which are quite worth re-telling. Eager eyes read them once, and hearts beat fast with passionate feeling over the scenes enacted. It may well be that they have interest still.

In setting out upon such wanderings we will begin with Prior Richard de Morins, who, in his time, made some stir in the world, and with those pious ancestors of Dunstable who were under his sway. To use the good old word, he "flourished" in that thirteenth century, which so high an authority as Dr. Stubbs has called "the golden age of English Churchmanship," and which Dr. Jessop, following suit, has called "the golden age of English Monachism." Here, if anywhere, we shall be likely to come upon those bounteous springs of pious beneficence, by which, as good Churchmen tell us, the Church was once enriched. In any case the tale we are about to re-tell was freely told, and is all the more likely to be true since it was a Churchman who told it.

"Downright Dunstable," "As plain as Dunstable road," are old sayings by which the popular mind has described the straight-away fashion in which the old Roman road, the Watling Street, crosses at right angles that other old Roman road, the Icknield Street, on a steep elevation of the chalk hills of South Bedfordshire. Here, at the four

cross-roads, on the site of the Roman town of Magiointum, rose, in the days of Henry I., and mainly by his proclamation, the new Dunstable—the staple or market on the down. By royal grant the townsmen had free rights as burghers, a free municipal government by twelve jurats, and various other privileges. The king himself took a liking to the place, built a house there called Kingsbury; and in after years the town was gay with gatherings of the Court, and with famous tournaments. But what is more to our purpose now, somewhere about 1181 the king founded a priory of Augustinian canons, to which he granted a general charter of rights.

The fourth of the priors who presided over this monastery was Richard de Morins, who came there from Merton in the year 1202. Beyond a single reference by Matthew Paris, we know nothing about Prior Richard but what he tells us himself. But then he tells us a good deal. Soon after coming to Dunstable he began to keep a Chronicle in the ecclesiastical Latin of the period, and continued the entries for about forty years. This Chronicle, a folio on parchment, has fortunately been preserved through many a stormy generation. It has long been among the Cotton MSS., and during the Civil Wars of Cromwell's time was hidden away with the rest of the Cotton Library at Stratton Park, in Bedfordshire; and in 1731 was injured by the fire by which that Library suffered so much. It gives a very vivid picture of thirteenth century life, with additional historic facts of interest to be found nowhere else; and one cannot but share the surprise expressed by Mr. Luard that so little use has been made of it by modern historians.\* It gives, for example, a reference to the Bunyan family, in Bedfordshire, as early as 1219; the prior telling us that he won a lawsuit against Henry Bunyun in the matter of the land of John Travayl.

\* Under the direction of the Master of the Rolls Mr. Luard edited the document for the Rolls Series in 1866: *Annales Monastici*; Vol. iii., "*Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia*." Dr. Pauli, with characteristic German thoroughness, found the Chronicle and made use of it. Mr. Nichols printed extracts from it in his "*Bibl. Topographica Brit.*," but no other historian seems to have noticed it.

We are furnished with additional contemporary notices of Simon de Montfort, and of the struggle between the barons and King John. We have vivid pictures of the condition of the country during the interdict laid by the pope upon the kingdom during this reign; how that for four years the dead were buried outside the churchyards without either priest or service; marriages and churchings were celebrated at the church doors, the sermon preached in the churchyard, and the "blessed bread" and the holy water given to the people there also. We see with what bitterness the English people had the Italian clergy forced upon their churches by the pope. "Italian succeeding to Italian" till open riots ensued. One Peter Vitella, for example, who could not speak a word of English, was made Vicar of Steppingly, in Bedfordshire; he farming out the living to Gilbert of Tingrith, and leaving the country only to return because the money was not duly paid, and to make fresh arrangements. In 1231 and 1232 there were serious riots against these appointments, and in 1259, when the pope set aside the appointment of the Archdeacon of Bedford made by the Dean and Chapter to a prebend in St. Paul's, the Italian put in his place was murdered in broad daylight in St. Paul's Churchyard, along with two of his companions. We see also with what terror the rule of that great reformer, Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, was regarded by the slothful, the sensual, and the vicious among the clergy. In 1235, Prior Richard tells us he displaced the Abbot of Leicester and six other abbots, the Prior of St. Frideswide and three other priors. Later on we read how Hugh de Bilenda, one of the canons, disappeared from Dunstable in the early dawn of a Sunday morning, rather than with an evil conscience face the dread bishop; how the Prior of Cauldwell resigned at the very sound of Grosseteste's coming; and how, in his visitation of 1237, he "suspended many rectors of churches." The days of the great Robert were days when a bishop was good for something, and when there was no *Church Times* to assail him ferociously, and to rail at his rule.

It would be easy to gather many pages of interesting

facts and side-lights from Prior Richard's parchment folios, but the space at our disposal compels us to turn at once to Prior Richard himself. He was a young man when he came from Merton to Dunstable in 1202, but he must have had considerable influence with the king, for in 1203 he was sent by him on a mission of a political character to Rome, and towards the end of July brought back with him a papal legate, whose business it was to bring about, if possible, a peace between the kings of England and France. Some years later also the prior tells us he was knighted with great solemnity by the mandate of the king. A sharp, shrewd, keen-eyed man of the world, more of a lawyer than a divine, he managed the priory estate admirably, increasing it with lands and flocks and mills. The reader of these "*Annales Prioratus*" will look through them in vain for a single pious expression. There is a good deal about the hundreds of sheep which he had upon the priory lands in the Peak, and how much he got per sack for his best wool and for his second best; much about the building of dove-houses, granges, barns, cow-houses and mills; much about the levies he made upon the churches to which the priory had the right of presentation, and much about the bargains he made with neighbouring monasteries and landowners, but not a sentence to indicate that the writer regarded himself in any sense as a minister of Christ. His lawsuits were simply legion. He seems to have been almost always at law, and his adversaries for the most part came off the worse for his exactions. He had considerable dealings with the Jews, but not apparently with any consuming desire for their conversion to the Christian faith. Among the rest he gave licence to Fleming the Jew and his son Leo "to pursue their lucre faithfully according to the custom of the Jews," by acting as pawnbrokers in the town, for which licence they paid him annually two silver spoons, each weighing twelve pennies. It will be admitted that he was a man of no ordinary ability, when it is mentioned that in 1221 he actually cheated the Jew Moses out of £700, on the plea that the deed by which it was secured was not genuine. It was clearly not genuine,

he said, because it had been washed (*lota*), and it contained false grammar, and there was a difference between the signature and the seal.

One means he had of increasing the priory wealth in common with other monasteries, was that of the system of *corrodies*. This was virtually a system of terminable annuities in the interests of piety, and based on the public faith in the financial condition of the priory. If a man had an estate sufficiently large, by handing it over to the prior at once his body could be provided for while he lived, and his soul prayed for when he was dead. Wherever he happened to be he was entitled to the same quantity and quality of food, drink, and other necessities, as were supplied to the canons at their regular meals. Though not at the same table, he thus in some sense eat with them, as the word *corrody* implied (*con-rodere*). The value of the material provision could be calculated on an average of years, but not the value of the prayers offered for the purchaser's soul. That was an unknown quantity, and therefore no estate was too large to offer for a *corrody*. The larger it was the better for the monastery.

But besides the income derived by the priory from farms, sheep ranges, mills, fisheries, church livings and *corrodies*, a large part of its revenue came from the tithes and offerings demanded from the townspeople of Dunstable. These, instead of being rendered in the cheerful and generous way in which we are sometimes told that our pious ancestors gave their tithes to the Church, appear, even six hundred years ago, to have been a perennial source of conflict. For, as the prior himself tells us, he not only demanded tithes of the produce of the land, but upon all earnings, both of male and female, and all the profits of trade wherever carried on (*super decimis negotiationis ubicunque exercitae*). A modern writer goes so far as to affirm that cases are known in which ecclesiastics extorted even from unfortunate women a tenth part of the wages of prostitution. Be that as it may, Prior Richard demanded tithes on the widest possible scale. No pious ancestor could possibly give to the Church the profits of another man's



trade beforehand, yet if a Dunstable man crossed the sea to France and Germany, he was required on his return to give a tenth of his profits on all commercial transactions to the priory church. If any man kept back any part of his tithes, not bringing them to the altar after Mass on Sunday mornings, or not making them good the following Lent, he was subject to a general sentence of excommunication, which carried nameless terrors to faithful souls. Rural simplicity submitted, but not always the sturdier burghers of the towns. In 1221 there arose a lawsuit between Prior Richard and the burgesses of Dunstable, which was given against them. It was ruled that tithes of all gains on business, wherever carried on, should be paid, and that to enforce them there should now be three excommunications at three separate periods of the year, instead of at Lent only. It appears that the Dunstable people had been in the habit of irritating the prior by bringing "frivolous, and derisory oblations" at weddings, churchings, and burials. These were now sternly forbidden, and the people enjoined to observe the "ancient and good custom" of the Church, and further they were charged not to neglect their pennies regularly (of present value about ninepence) for the fabric of the priory church.

Thus was this matter of tithes and offerings smoothed over. But not for long. In 1227 the prior contrived to be made provost of the town, in which capacity he levied heavy amercements upon all offenders in the municipal courts. Against his proceedings the townsmen rose in rebellion. They protested against his fines, against his habit of introducing foreigners upon inquests in which the interests of the burgesses were concerned; and against the violent and tyrannical manner in which he had sought to enforce the judgments thus obtained, contending that he had no right to distrain the goods of the burgesses in the public street within the town; and, finally, they denied his right to cite to the Court of King's Bench those between whom and himself there had arisen disputes in his own court. On these and other questions they went to law with the prior, the case coming on before the itinerant justices

on circuit at Dunstable. These justices, however, were unable to settle the question of right, and referred the case to the Court of King's Bench. The end of it all was that the townsmen found themselves worse off than before. Those were days of notoriously gross corruption, and the prior and canons obtained from the king (Henry III.) a confirmation of their charter, together with a new clause granting to them "all aids, amercements, suits, services, and customs, such as we or our heirs would have held if the aforesaid borough of Dunstable and the said burgesses were in our hand." For this very oppressive clause the prior and canons paid the king £100, no small sum when wheat was only five shillings a quarter; and they actually demanded of the burgesses that they should pay 100 marks towards this purchase money of a document meant to subject them to ecclesiastical tyranny. When John de Flitte and John de Cateby, the prior's bailiffs, proceeded to collect this rate in aid they were naturally met by resistance and violence. In particular the prior mentions that when they proceeded to distrain the wheat of Martin Duke and John Young these men were supported by several of their fellow-townsmen, and there was a regular pitched battle, with wounded men on both sides. Still, as the prior tells us with a quiet chuckle, his side got the best of it, for that, in spite of all opposition, his men brought a cart half full of wheat into the priory court. Many lawsuits sprang out of this encounter, which all came to nothing.

It is hardly to be expected after this that there was a very tender feeling towards the Church, or much sweet reasonableness in the men of Dunstable. Beaten by corruption and force before king and justice, they resolved upon retaliation in a different quarter. Ten of the burgesses entered into a compact to strike a blow at the revenues of the prior derived from the offerings made at weddings, churchings, and funerals. Instead of each of the party present on such occasions making an offering, it was determined that "two persons only should follow the principal person." At once the prior excommunicated the ten burgesses who had organized the revolt, and as excom-

municated persons, they ought then to have been boycotted by their neighbours. On the contrary, they found themselves the heroes of the hour. Instead of being kept out of the church, they were publicly escorted thither at the time of high mass by a large concourse of their neighbours. This brought down the ecclesiastical thunderbolt at once. The whole town was placed under solemn interdict, so that for more than two months, from the 1st of August to the 9th of October, no religious service was permitted either in church or churchyard. Then appeared upon the scene the Bishop of Lincoln "with a multitude of clergy and chaplains," through whose mediation there came a lull in the storm. But the following year there was another outbreak, during which, as the prior tells us, there was so great a fury on the part of the people that, from hatred to the Church, they withdrew their tithes and offerings, and even allowed the fabric of the church to fall into grievous disrepair. They touched the prior even closer still, for in the open church they proclaimed a ban upon his mill, and entered into a compact to grind their corn elsewhere, thus cutting off a large part of his revenue; they trampled down the corn which he had wrongfully sown on the common land of the town, and carried off his horse. In all these proceedings they were assisted by the bailiffs of the neighbouring landholders, who had probably not a few grievances of their own.

The storm was at its height at the time the king's chancellor and the chief justice passed through the town, to whom the prior told his story, at which, he says, they seemed to be angry and threatened the burgesses. But to very little purpose. For as soon as they were gone, and on the occasion of the sheriff's officer proceeding to distrain for the prior's levy, the whole population, w. men as well as men, rose up and drove the bailiff away. What was to be done? As a last resource, the prior once more called in Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, who ordered the burgesses to be publicly excommunicated in all the burghs and deaneries round. By this time, however, excommunication was little more than a spent shot with the men of Dunstable. They

simply replied that they were excommunicated already, and, alas! for the memory of our pious ancestors, they went on to say that they would rather go to hell than let the prior tax them as he liked (*se velle potius ad infernum descendere quam in causa tallagii succumbere*). Englishmen may be long patient, but once roused, they are resolute, and so resolute were these men that they prepared to leave the town, and go beyond the prior's jurisdiction. They actually entered into treaty with William de Cantilupe for forty acres of land to which they might migrate and set up the beginnings of a new town. With true ecclesiastical tenacity the prior once more made an appeal to the courts of law, but to no purpose, for, as he rather frankly tells us himself, the judges were thoroughly wearied out with him and his quarrels, and would do nothing, so that "infinite wrongs went unpunished." Fortunately, in this time of "abounding iniquity," "the Lord visited the spirit of Master John, Archdeacon of Bedford," by whose friendly intervention a "final concord" was reached at last.

So runs this story, as it is told to us, not by the men of Dunstable, but by the prior himself. Had they given us their version also, the general effect might have been even more vivid, it could scarcely have been more damaging to ecclesiastical rule than is this Chronicle from the pen of a priest. If other monastic chronicles had been preserved they would probably have had similar stories to tell, for, as the continuation of the Dunstable Chronicle shows, things were little better under Prior Richard's successors for the next fifty years than they were under Prior Richard himself. It is difficult to go back far enough to find the golden age, equally difficult to find the time when men paid the priest's exactions under constraint of law with loving hearts. Huge ecclesiastical hierarchies, backed by the power of the State, have much to answer for in the indifference of large bodies of men to the faith of Christ; and one longs for the time when the unholy alliance shall cease; when Christian brotherhood shall have wider sweep; and when the gospel of God's love shall go forth unprejudiced and unhampered by the selfish, worldly schemes of man.

JOHN BROWN.

## LORD SELBORNE ON DISESTABLISHMENT.

## I.

It might be supposed that in Lord Selborne the Establishment has found an ideal champion. He is a past-master in all questions relating to the law of property; and as so much is made to turn upon the right of the Church to the large revenue which it at present enjoys, it is of infinite importance to have the subtle arguments of so distinguished a pleader. To us, who hold the extent and mode of Disendowment a matter of secondary moment, this acknowledged acquaintance with the law does not appear the highest qualification for the task. Whenever this reform is taken in hand by the English people these questions of property will be settled, not on mere technical grounds, but on the far broader and more intelligible basis of common sense and common justice; and he will then be found the most powerful advocate for the Church who can appeal with most effect to the religious sympathies of a nation never unwilling to requite acknowledged service or anxious to press a just principle to an extreme conclusion. We might have hoped to find in Lord Selborne one who could have used even this weapon with effect. He is known as a devout Churchman rather than a hard Erastian. His "Book of Praise" seemed to breathe a Catholic spirit, capable of appreciating the spiritual excellence of good men outside his own communion. There seemed, therefore, to be in him a remarkable combination of qualities which fitted him for the task he has undertaken—the subtlety of the lawyer, the broad and generous sentiment of the earnest Christian, the love of liberty and right which should distinguish a Liberal of "light and leading."

His lordship's book does not bear out these anticipations. That it is extremely able *cela va sans dire*. But it is the work of an accomplished lawyer, not of a far-seeing statesman, still less of a sound and convinced, if moderate, Liberal, least of all of a large-hearted Christian who, while firm in asserting his own principles, is careful to understand the position and respect the rights of those who

conscientiously differ from him. Those of us who through the whole of Mr. Gladstone's second administration felt that the presence of Lord Selborne in the Cabinet was an anomaly and a weakness will have their views abundantly confirmed by this book. In truth, as we read, our wonder continually grows how a politician with such sentiments can ever have had a place in the Liberal party at all. It affords indeed another reason why we should attempt a more clear definition of the term Liberal. We have no desire to regulate politics in the fashion which the State has seen fit to adopt in relation to our religion, and to establish an Act of Uniformity for the Liberal party, to share the failure common to all such acts through non-natural interpretations and other modes of evasion. But it is surely necessary that there should be some understanding as to what differentiates a Liberal from a Tory. If it be only that a Liberal assumes to be a superior style of person, who professes to conduct affairs in a more intelligent manner than a Tory, but is at one with him in the belief that every effort should be made for the maintenance of the institutions which have made England the Paradise of the rich and favoured classes, we have no interest whatever in a struggle which really becomes little more than a personal wrangle or a faction fight. It may be that but few of the higher class of minds can retain their allegiance to the hard traditions of the past, and that, if only for the interests of their own order, the most sagacious politicians will find their way to the cross benches, if they do not actually pass over to the Liberal side. Still all wisdom does not dwell, never has dwelt, on those who gravitate to either of these benches. Unless there be a great question of principle at issue we see no reason why Lord Salisbury should not be allowed to hold the same kind of position as his illustrious ancestor, and have a life-tenure of his distinguished office. Government by party has many and obvious disadvantages, and is only tolerable on the assumption that a party is an organization for the advancement of principle. One of the leading objects of the Liberal party we have always understood to

be the assertion of the rights of the people in opposition to the unjust privileges of a class. But if this be so, it is not easy to understand what claim Lord Selborne has to be esteemed a Liberal. In these latter days at all events he has devoted himself to the defence of vested rights. Of course he is one of the Unionist chiefs, but he shares that distinction with others who, though they dissent from Mr. Gladstone's bills, would judge the Irish claims in a spirit more in harmony with Liberal sentiments and Liberal traditions. Lord Selborne's difference with the Liberal party, however, began prior to the development of the Irish policy of the late Government. As a Mercer he proclaimed himself a champion of the vested rights of City Companies, and, pursuing the same line of policy, he was one of the leaders of that movement in defence of the Establishment by Liberal peers and others which infused so much bitterness in the election of last year.

How Lord Selborne may describe his present political position we know not and we do not greatly care; for, under whatever banner, he is serving the Tory cause. Indeed, as things go, if we had strong Tory principles, we should regret that his lordship is not still Lord Chancellor, for in the Cabinet he might put a check upon the vagaries of Lord Randolph Churchill, such as none of his present colleagues seem able to apply. One qualification his lordship possesses for the office he has undertaken. He appears absolutely free from any doubt as to the soundness of his own position, and he certainly does his best to preserve that comfortable state of mind by dispensing with all efforts to understand the case of his opponents. He has read the "Case for Disestablishment" put forth by the Liberation Society, and he professes to give its arguments; is doubtless persuaded he has done so. But he has either failed to understand them, or he has chosen to adopt a course which is dangerous for any advocate, and has sought to win an easy but illusive victory, by ignoring the strong points in his adversary's contention. Four pages are devoted to the "religious argument," and then, with quiet self-complacency, he adds—

I have bestowed upon this (so-called) religious argument more space than it deserves. I have only done so because it is characteristic of the movement in the service of which it is used, and because we are told that the motives and principles which depend upon this argument, "are those of the great majority of the present supporters of the 'Liberation Society,' " (p. 81).

This is the spirit which the Establishment nurtures. It is not easy to characterize such a mode of treating the scruples of multitudes of men, who are just as likely to form correct views of the nature of Christ's kingdom as the most eminent lawyer, and whose conscientious convictions are, on his own principles, whether as a Christian or a Liberal, entitled to equal respect. His lordship does not distinctly say that the appeal to religious motives is a piece of insincerity or affectation, but as much is implied in the tone of his remarks. He is half-impatient with himself for employing his mind in the examination of arguments which appear to him hardly serious. This is a kind of impolicy which is sure to defeat its own purpose. Whatever his lordship may think, there are numbers of devout men who resent the wrong done to the religion of Christ by the action of the Establishment. He may find them even among his fellow-Churchmen. It is not Nonconformists alone who feel, to take but one example at present, the evils which exist under a system of Patronage which would not be tolerated for a day were the Church free from the entanglements of the Establishment. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that there may be religious objections to an institution, which (to take the case that called forth such scathing satire from the Americans who had made the acquaintance of this distinguished member of the peerage) gives an Earl of Lonsdale the nomination to some forty livings. We might go further and say that it should be possible, even for so uncompromising a defender of the Establishment as Lord Selborne, to understand that the consciences of some may be shocked by a system, we will not say which makes it possible that the nomination of the Primate and his suffragan bishops may pass into the hands of an avowed Agnostic, but which did actually give this power to Lord



Palmerston. We name his lordship, not because he was less fitted for the task than other Prime Ministers, but because we have before us the estimate of the statesman by his devoted friend and relative, to whom he practically surrendered a prerogative which he felt himself incompetent to exercise. We know that all good Evangelicals were half-disposed to regard it as a special interposition of Divine Providence on behalf of their faith, but we must remind them that the Premier's deference to Lord Shaftesbury was a mere accident. What was of the essence of the system was that the appointment should be in the hands of a Premier, of whose fitness for the work Lord Shaftesbury has supplied us with the means of judging—

I much fear (he says) that Palmerston's ecclesiastical appointments will be detestable. He does not know the theology of Moses from Sydney Smith. The vicar of Romsey, when he goes to Church, is the only clergyman he ever spoke to, and as for the wants, the feelings, the views, the hopes and fears of the country, and particularly the religious part of it, they are as strange to him as the interior of Japan. Why, it was only a short time ago that he heard, for the first time, of the grand heresy of the Puseyites and Tractarians ("Shaftesbury's Life," vol. ii. p. 505).

This is a friend's picture of the man who nominated a large proportion of the Episcopal bench and, to that extent, affected the character of the Anglican Church. Cannot Lord Selborne understand that there are pious hearts to whom this is an offence? There was no lack of such objectors among Churchmen themselves when Lord John Russell appointed Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, and they used language quite as decided as that of Nonconformists. Probably it might have been the same had Lord Palmerston acted upon his own instincts and nominated bishops whose religious views were in accord with his celebrated answer to the memorial in favour of a day of humiliation. What happened was, that Lord Shaftesbury became the great bishop-maker during the lengthened period of his eminent kinsman's administration. But that did not change the system of which this prerogative of the Prime Minister is a natural and consistent part. In that system the nation is

the Church. What more natural than to give the Head of the nation who, in our Constitution, acts through regularly appointed ministers, the nomination of its chief officers. That those who have taken their ideas of the Church from the New Testament should object to this arrangement, and the principle which underlies it on religious grounds is, to say the least, not very marvellous, and Lord Selborne, if he does not concur with them, should at least have been able to appreciate the force of their contention. We are glad to quote, in support of our view, the singularly temperate and reasonable remarks of *The Spectator*, which is as zealous for the Establishment as Lord Selborne himself, but which frankly says that it "cannot regard with the supreme contempt evinced by Lord Selborne the desire for 'religious equality,' which is at the bottom of the movement of the Liberation Society." To his lordship, the inequality between the Established and the Free Churches is very much on a parallel with the social and political inequality which results from the existence of a Crown and an aristocracy. On this *The Spectator* remarks—

But there again, we think him deficient in sympathy with the Nonconformists. The very importance which they attach to the subject of religious conviction, and to the purity of religious motives, obliges them to think of the admixture of worldly motives with religious professions as a much greater evil than that admixture of worldly motives with political opinions which is caused by the existence of a Throne and a House of Lords. A pious Nonconformist very naturally says to himself, that to let the World enter the region of religion is a much greater mischief than to let it enter the region of social and political effort. And we confess that on this point we agree with the pious Nonconformist. Now, when there is such a great variety of religious opinions, it is, so far as it goes, a misfortune that there should be a great historical cause in existence tending to increase and consolidate the power of those who profess one creed, and a cause which is not properly a religious cause at all, which does not arise from the excellence of the creed professed, but from the dignity and social standing of those who profess it. We hold, then, that Lord Selborne's book will exercise somewhat less influence for good than it might have exercised, through Lord Selborne's inability to enter heartily into the attitude of the more religious Nonconformists.

This might, with truth, have been put much more strongly. It may safely be said that this lack of a religious sympathy, which Lord Selborne might fairly have been expected to show, will deprive his book of influence where he should have been most anxious to secure it. So far as religious Dissenters are concerned, they are not insensible to the good which the Episcopal Church is doing in this country, and so far are they from any desire to hamper or curtail its religious influence out of a wretched spirit of sectarian jealousy, that they would, we are satisfied, be ready to make large concessions, not only to equity, but even to generous sentiment in the application of what they believe to be righteous principles as to the national property. If they could be convinced that the present arrangements of the State Church are part of the Divine order, they would acquiesce; if they could even be shown that they do not involve a distinct violation of the spiritual character and a consequent weakening of the spiritual force of the church, they would probably abstain from active opposition. But Lord Selborne does not even attempt this. So far as the "religious argument" is concerned, he treats it in so slight and unsatisfactory a manner that practically judgment is left to go by default. Instead of this, he treats us to learned historical disquisitions and subtle legal arguments, of which we can only say what Abraham Lincoln said to some one who asked him what he thought of a tea-party, "Well, this kind of thing will be liked by those who like this kind of thing." We shall endeavour to meet it as best we can, but whatever its value it leaves our main argument untouched. We may well be excused if we think it unanswerable.

Lord Selborne's introductory letter to Mr. Gladstone is extremely curious. It ministered great satisfaction to the heart of *The Times*, but it must have been read with equal astonishment and regret by every true-hearted Liberal. We remember saying to a friend who was mourning over the defeat of Mr. Gladstone by the snatch majority of Tory Parnellites which brought the administration of 1880 to a close, that there was, at least, one compensation for

what seemed to be a misfortune, in that we had seen the last of Lord Selborne in a Liberal Cabinet. Having carefully watched his lordship's development, we had been satisfied for some time that whatever Liberalism he ever had, had long since spent its force, and that he had become a weakness to the party. But in our most suspicious moments we never imagined that his estrangement from Liberal ideas was so extreme as is indicated in this letter. His remarks on the "consent of the nation" strike at the very root of representative government altogether.

However necessary for the working of a constitutional system the power of Parliamentary majorities may be, and however clearly it may be the duty of the subjects of the realm to submit to laws so made, it is only in a fictitious and conventional sense that everything so done can be represented as done with the general consent of the nation. There may be, and there often has been, a clear, sometimes a large party majority in Parliament returned by an inconsiderable aggregate majority of the total number of votes given by the constituency. The minority must submit, but when it constitutes nearly half the nation (perhaps more if women and other non-electors are taken into account), what is done against its will cannot reasonably be said to be done with general consent (pp. xii. and xiii.).

In such case, however, it is hard to say what could be done with the "general consent." If it is not given to the will of the majority, it surely cannot be assumed on behalf of the opinions of the minority, however large that minority. What really follows from Lord Selborne's argument is that the Established Church does not exist with the "general consent" of the nation. There is undoubtedly a very large minority opposed to its continuance. Whether a majority is opposed to Disestablishment depends, we believe, upon the way in which the question is submitted. Put it in the form which Church defenders are so fond of putting it forward—Shall the Church be disestablished and disendowed on the lines laid down in "The Radical Programme"? and the probability is there would be a majority in the negative. But suppose we separate between Disestablishment and Disendowment, and put the question thus—Shall one Church and its bishops and clergy enjoy special privileges from the

State? and we have little doubt that the answer would be such as to prove conclusively that the "consent of the nation" is not with a system of sectarian ascendancy. If we were to condescend to particulars and ask—Should the Bishops have seats in the House of Lords? we fancy that Lord Selborne and his friends would be astonished at the strength of the emphatic "No," which would be heard in response, and in which not a few earnest Churchmen would join. Defenders of the Establishment are wise in their generation when they insist on treating the two questions of privilege and endowment together, for they know that there are numbers who hold that the Church has a right to the endowments and are unwilling to see it disturbed in the tenure, who are fully alive to the invidious nature of these privileges, and would gladly see them abolished. For Disestablishment, could the vote on it be taken alone, we believe there would be a clear majority, especially after the nation had been educated into its real meaning. But however this be, it is hard to see how, on his own principles, Lord Selborne can maintain that the Establishment has the "consent of the nation." The practical conclusion is that in the present state of opinion the solution will be by a majority. We have no desire to precipitate the change, or to see it carried by a small, still less by a factitious, Parliamentary majority which does not represent a strong preponderance of public opinion. For that we are content to wait, in the full assurance that the time is not distant when it will be secured. The whole contention, however, appears to us to be a needless diversion—a bit of special pleading worthy of a lawyer's skill, but without any practical result. Assuredly a Liberal should not have been found using an argument which, if it has any force at all, means that vested rights shall be maintained until there is virtual unanimity in the nation in opposition to them. A very convenient doctrine this for a member of a House of Lords which has constituted itself the champion of established justice, but one altogether out of place in a Liberal chief.

But there is even worse beyond. There was a time when Sir Roundell Palmer owed his position largely to Noncon-

formist support. He needs that support no longer, and so he writes now :

Some of those with whom Disestablishment is a principal object have a great deal to do with the management of party organizations for Parliamentary purposes, and have used, and will use, their power in that way systematically for this object. Whether the people of England understand the conditions of the question or not, it is, I fear, only too likely to be thought enough if a Parliamentary majority can be at any time secured. One important step towards the accomplishment of any political design is the advancement of a considerable number of its more prominent advocates to positions of influence and authority in the State ; and this (whether through some inevitable necessity, or for any other reason) certainly happened under the Administration which resulted from your success in the elections of 1885 (p. xvii.).

We knew before that Lord Selborne was annoyed by Mr. Gladstone's victory in 1885, but we were quite unprepared for such an outburst as this. If his lordship has the courage and the logic of his opinions, his desire must be to exclude Nonconformists and others who believe in Disestablishment, not only from the Cabinet, but from the Parliament itself. His lordship is very anxious to maintain the union between England and Ireland ; but it would seem as though he were perfectly indifferent to the preservation of unity in England itself. He has, in fact, his own little device for widening the breach which separates Churchmen from Dissenters. He tells us our grievances are ended, and therefore he seems desirous to impose on us a new one of his own manufacture. According to him we may be the hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Liberal party, but its prizes are to be reserved for all who are willing to maintain an Established Church.

---

### CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

*The Story of the Four (Evangelists).* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A. *The Picture of Jesus.* By the same.

THESE volumes might be entitled, "The Gospel according to the Rev. H. R. Haweis." A very different Gospel, it

must be confessed, from that which is familiar to us in the original Evangelists. But to a large number of readers, just at present, this will seem a lively and entertaining change. They do not feel up to the severe dignity, majestic simplicity, intense reverence, of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The claim made by the Christian Church during so many centuries, on behalf of these ancient books, to a superhuman authority—a Divine authorship, above and underneath that of the human writers—offends the self-conceit of such readers. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit does not fit in well with the inspiration of the nineteenth century—the “Zeitgeist.” It is therefore, to such minds, a great relief and enjoyment to have the most sacred of all histories brought down to newspaper level, in a telling, sharp, somewhat frisky style, fearless in assertion, unconscious of reverence, richly flavoured with destructive criticism, and pervaded with boundless faith in the superiority of our wonderful century over its eighteen predecessors. Of such a style, these volumes present a singularly perfect specimen. They are therefore secure of popularity.

Mr. Haweis, as we know from his previous works, is admirable when dealing with such topics as “Money and Morals,” “The Confessional,” “Mr. Gladstone on Christianity.” He hits hard, straight from the shoulder, and enjoys the exercise. He has a keen and rapid eye, if no deep insight; a ready wit for analogies, by no means always sound; a true and warm sympathy with the oppressed, the ill-treated, and all who are cheated of their fair share in the great banquet of life; above all, an intensely modern spirit. He is at home in questions of the day; powerful and instructive when dealing with them. As concerns the past, he likes to try the effect of a tourist suit and wide-awake on the Apollo Belvedere; regards the pen of Strauss or Renan as the true Ithuriel’s spear, and thinks that truth is to be discovered in the Sacred Writings as some obscure disease is detected in the human frame (after death)—by dissection. One cannot but regret that such undoubted talent and force should be turned aside from the field to which they are adapted, to deal with

themes which require far different treatment. It is well to climb the mountains; but if it be merely to lose ourselves in fog, it would be wiser to stay below.

Mr. Haweis would no doubt tell us that truth and honesty are the most genuine reverence in treating the most sacred themes. And in a sense this is so. But truth and honesty do not necessitate dealing in a jaunty, off-hand style with matters so august—call them Realities or Church dogmas as you will—as the Trinity and the Incarnation. Mr. Haweis accepts the doctrine of the Trinity, not on the authority of the Baptismal Formula, or of Apostolic teaching; still less because as a clergyman of the Church of England he is bound to accept it. “Not at all;” but on his own authority; “because the very constitution of my mind compels me to conceive of God in that way, and in no other” (*“Arrows in the Air,”* p. 23). But the doctrine of the Incarnation, as St. Paul states it, —“*God sent forth His Son, made of a woman,*”—he does not accept. Without flagrantly contradicting the Prayer Book by a flat denial, he does what seems much less reverent—puts it on one side as “a matter of comparative unimportance” (*“Picture,”* p. 13). He states the alternative view “which will perhaps commend itself to some as the most reverent of the two,” in terms which we confess we shrink from quoting. An odour of vulgarity hangs about his whole treatment of his Divine theme, very different from “the perfumes of Galilee” of which he speaks.

For reasons which become apparent as the discussion proceeds, Mr. Haweis maintains that the Gospel of Mark is the earliest; but arbitrarily pushes on its date to “about 70 to 74” (A.D.). The clear indication in Mark xiii. 15 that it was published before the Fall of Jerusalem, is of course ignored. He accepts—as indeed it would be the very fanaticism of scepticism to reject—the tradition that Mark was the companion of Peter, and that his Gospel represents the preaching of that leading Apostle. This does not, however, prevent the highly imaginative, audacious, and unwarrantable statement that to Pella, to which the Christians of Jerusalem fled previous to the siege—



That little band of disciples and relations of Jesus carried with them all that was remembered of the obscure Nazarene who had flashed into passing notoriety, dazzled the crowd, and then been crucified, and by most forgotten. Fragments of His strange story had indeed survived, *but as yet there was no written Gospel*. The far-off Pella in 68 was no doubt the land, if not of the written rills, yet surely of the oral freshets which were destined ere long to flow into the four Gospel rivers; *but as yet there is no trace of a written Gospel! . . . None of the Gospels were [was?] written down until half a century after the events recorded in them*" ("Story," p. 11).

The italics are Mr. Haweis' own. In his assertion he is of course following Dr. Matthew Arnold. His graceful allusion to "a rabid orthodoxy" we omit. On the style in which he thinks fit to refer to our Blessed Lord, further comment is needless. At the time when Mr. Haweis asserts He was "by most forgotten," Jesus was worshipped by myriads—probably hundreds of thousands—from Rome to Babylon and the far East, as the world's Saviour. But it is important to bear in mind that even if we accept so unreasonably late a date as A.D. 74 for Mark's Gospel, from A.D. 30, the year of the crucifixion (for which Mr. Haweis gives the exploded date A.D. 33), to A.D. 70, is not half a century, but forty years. Ten years make a great difference where human memory is concerned. There are still, for instance, a large number of persons who well remember the first visit of the late John B. Gough to this country, and his dramatic recitals of his own experience. In another ten years, a large proportion of these will have passed away. But in the meantime, Mr. Gough continued lecturing in public up to the day of his death, repeating the same statements, often in nearly the same words, to tens of thousands of hearers every year. It would be ridiculous to call the report either of his first hearers or of those present at his last lecture "oral tradition." It is contemporary testimony.

Now, substitute for Mr. Gough the Apostle Peter. What must be the condition of any one's mind as to critical perception, or even historical imagination, who can talk of Peter's public preaching for between thirty and forty years as "*oral freshets*"? It was the full unbroken tide of living

testimony, "confirmed unto us by them that heard;"—the testimony of one who could say "*Quorum pars magna fui*"; who lived but to deliver that testimony, whether to little eager groups in scattered homes; or to public gatherings of hundreds or thousands; or before benches of magistrates; and who would have died rather than falsify his narrative or hold his peace. "*We cannot but speak,*" said he, "the things we have seen and heard." The remarkable words of 2 Pet. i. 15 show his anxiety that his testimony should be faithfully recorded; and thus point not obscurely to Mark's Gospel.

Not only by Mr. Haweis, but by his master, Dr. Matthew Arnold, and by all critics who sail on the same tack, these facts are strangely kept out of view. Yet they are all-important. The very purpose for which apostles were appointed was to bear witness to the facts of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Divine guidance was sought, previous to the day of Pentecost, in filling the vacant place of Judas from among those who had been companions of the Twelve, "beginning" [as Mark's Gospel begins] "from the baptism of John" to the very day of the Ascension (Acts i. 21-2). We do not know that there was any other great preacher among the Twelve besides Peter. John was a "son of thunder";—the only one among the New Testament writers in whom we discern that peculiar temper and fire which we name 'genius'; but his profound, sententious style bespeaks the Teacher, not the Orator. Peter steps to the front on the day of Pentecost, and keeps his place, until a yet greater preacher, a teacher not inferior to John, endued with special gifts and culture for such a work, is commissioned to carry the message of the Cross to the Greek and Roman world; and receives from Peter and John the frank hand of brotherly confidence, that he "should go to the nations, and they to the Circumcision." Peter's preaching, we may be certain, ceased only when he "put off his tabernacle."

If, then, Mark's Gospel contains the substance of Peter's preaching, as the Evangelist was in the habit of hearing it, there was no need for him to go to Pella, or anywhere

else, in quest of either "written rills" or "oral freshets." His only difficulty must have been the abundance of his materials. He begins, as Peter did (Acts i. 22, x. 37) with the Baptism of John, and the ministry of Our Lord in Galilee; and he ends, like Peter, with the Ascension.\*

Mr. Haweis begins his account of the characteristics of St. Mark's Gospel by telling us that—

Peter, the most liberal of Judaic Christians, remained to the end Judaic—that is, he retained the Jewish way of thinking about Jesus as the Jewish Messiah or Christ rather than the world's Saviour. In Mark there is no attempt to define the Divine nature of Christ. Jesus is the Messiah—the Elect of God—the Christ; never the Son of God—only once (Mark i. 1) "a Son of God;" four times "the Son of Man." In the first verse of St. Mark our translators have deliberately falsified the text by translating *uios tou theou*, "the Son of" [*sic*] instead of "a Son": and the translators of the New Revised Version have been too much afraid of the Unitarians to correct it ("Story," pp. 25-6).

An author—above all a preacher—ought to make very sure of his ground before venturing to print a libel like this against any one; especially against such men as our Translators and Revisers. In this case, there is no ground to make sure of. Every boy who has learned the first page of his Greek grammar knows that in Greek there is no indefinite article. Consequently there is no such phrase as "a son of God." Literally rendered, St. Mark writes, "Jesus Christ, Son of God." But what does this mean? In Luke i. 5, the revised text reads, "In the days of Herod, King of Judæa." Would any one translate this "a king of Judæa"? But in Rom. i. 4, St. Paul has precisely St. Mark's phrase. Would even Mr. Haweis venture to translate "*declared to be a Son of God*"? Or will he dare to charge the Translators and Revisers here also with deliberate falsification?

Equally unjustifiable is the assertion that in this Gospel Jesus is "never the Son of God." In the very first chapter (ver. 11) He is so addressed by the Voice from Heaven; and

\* That is, if we accept the closing verses of his Gospel as either constituting or representing the original conclusion, for which Dr. Salmon argues with great force.

again, chap. ix. 7. Twice He is acknowledged as the Son of God by the spirits whom He cast out with His word (iii. 11; v. 7). In this, as in the other Gospels, Our Lord speaks of God as "His Father" (viii. 38), or to the disciples as "your Father" (xi. 25); never once classing Himself with us by saying "Our Father." It is in this Gospel that we have that remarkable passage which by its very limitation sets in fuller relief the unique Sonship of Jesus—"No man, no, not even the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Lastly, Mark, as well as Matthew, gives Our Lord's answer to the High Priest's adjuration to say whether He were "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed." "And Jesus said, I am" (xiv. 61, 62).

We submit to Mr. Haweis that he owes it to himself, as an honest man, as well as to his readers, to cancel this passage in future editions of his book, and to apologize for his libel on the Translators and Revisers.

Of course Mr. Haweis makes short work of the ancient claim of Matthew's Gospel to rank as the earliest of the Four; or indeed to have had, properly speaking, any author at all. The oral freshets and written rills again come into full play. The so-called Gospel of Matthew, it seems, is a compilation clumsily put together—"a somewhat rough Mosaic"—of reports of Our Lord's "speeches" with Mark's narrative. Of the internal evidence which careful criticism discerns to be utterly fatal to the notion that the parallel passages in this Gospel are *copied* from Mark, Mr. Haweis is either unconscious or regardless. Having chosen to date Mark's Gospel "about 70-75," he conjectures this Gospel to have been published some ten years later. "But" (he tells us)—

There seems to have been a still earlier Hebrew Gospel current in Palestine. It may have been compiled by the fugitives at Pella, and consisted of oral traditions, including perhaps an important batch of sentences and fragmentary discourses of Our Lord, known as the *Logia* of Matthew (p. 41).

A few pages further on Mr. Haweis is good enough to show us the Compiler at work: a very unskilful, unfaithful, inaccurate person he seems to have been. He is perplexed

between "the *Logia*, or some other collection," and St. Mark, who gives some sentence or event in another order. "So down go both versions in his Gospel." He does not like to give up either "his Hebrew-Syriac material and the *Logia*," or "his Græco-Roman material or St. Mark, and so they are mosaiced into different parts of the new Gospel according to St. Matthew" (p. 46). It is such an unvarnished unintelligent hodge-podge, in which no fact is quite trustworthy, no saying quite beyond suspicion, which the Christian Church for eighteen centuries has ignorantly treasured as one of her "living oracles." Nevertheless, Mr. Haweis advises us to go "straight to the Sermon on the Mount" if we wish "to know what Christ taught"; and rejoices that "all the favourite dogmas of the Church have, somehow, been left out of it." He finds here "no Trinity, no Eternal Punishment, no Atonement, no Justification by Faith, no doctrine concerning the Inspiration of the Bible, the nature of the Sacraments, or Church Government." He is "not saying that the Church's dogmas are not true;" but since they are not in the Sermon on the Mount, he draws "the distinction between Christianity and the religion of Christ" ("*Picture*," p. 92).

Let us turn on these and similar wild statements the light of common-sense. Our Saviour in those great parables which even Mr. Haweis attributes to Matthew's pen, and throughout His ministry, assigns the first place to His "word"—His "truth"—in the planting and extension of His kingdom. His parting injunction to His disciples, gathered in hundreds at His command, was, to make disciples of all nations, teaching them all He Himself had taught. He promised (if Mr. Haweis will allow us to quote St. John) the aid of the Holy Spirit to bring all to their remembrance, and guide them into all the truth. They therefore "went everywhere preaching the word." With the full exposition of Christian doctrine (in which St. Paul asserts that his own teaching and that of the Twelve were in perfect agreement; 1 Cor. xv. 11), went the narrative of the life, works, death, and resurrection of the Saviour. And these first Christian teachers evidently believed that they

had the promised aid of the Spirit. They spoke with authority, not their own, but Christ's. They shut us up to the alternative, that if they were not inspired they must have been either dishonest or insane.

Now, to ignore these main facts, (1) that the whole movement and fabric of Christianity were based on public teaching—carried within thirty years of the Ascension through the world from Rome to the far East; and (2) that the substance of this teaching was the gospel history and the doctrine of Jesus; is to fling away the keys of criticism, and to render impossible any true view of "Christ and Christianity." In view of these facts, the attempt to wrap the Gospel records in fog by postponing their date to "half a century after the events," and representing them as the private reminiscences of a few believers, is—to use the mildest term—supremely ridiculous. Let us hear no more of "oral freshets"!

The analogy drawn from the Jewish oral law, by which discredit is sought to be cast on the early existence of written Gospels, is wholly fallacious. The traditions embodied in the Mishna grew up, like our English common law, from particular cases and decisions, as a standing commentary on the Written Law; the possession of a professional class. A professional class of teachers would have been sure to arise in the Christian Church, even if the Lord had not from the first appointed "some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." But the facts and doctrines of Christianity were from the beginning the possession of the whole Christian community.

St. Luke's Gospel Mr. Haweis dates, contrary to all probability, as late as "90-100" (A.D.) As he never seems aware that his critical conclusions are open to question, he takes no note of the evidence supplied by the abrupt close of the Acts, that that book, even if not cut short by the death of the writer, was at all events written before the close of St. Paul's imprisonment—thirty years before the date here assigned to the Gospel. And of course "the former treatise" must have been earlier still. Luke, Mr. Haweis thinks, was "an ardent partisan of Paul, perhaps a little

at the expense of Peter;" held, in fact, a brief for his Master, and coloured his narrative so as secretly to depress Peter and exalt Paul. Mr. Haweis says some true things, forcibly, and even beautifully, about this Gospel; but to what purpose, when he has first tarred it with the brush of so gross a suspicion of dishonesty,—inspiration being of course out of the question?

The Fourth Gospel—"John the Fisherman's Story"—is still more cruelly mangled in Mr. Haweis' hands than the three earlier ones. His outline of the relations between the two great apostles, John and Paul, is such as to reflect little credit on either. The Gospel itself, we are told, "was put into elegant Greek at Ephesus by some accomplished scribe." Whether St. John got the same scribe to write his first Epistle, we are not informed. This theory is not to prevent our believing that "we doubtless have the most precious memories of A.D. 30-33" in this Gospel; but it enables us to reject anything in it we please. Accordingly, having devoted a whole section ("*Picture*," pp. 223-239) to the vindication of that much misunderstood Apostle—Judas, for whom Mr. Haweis displays an enthusiasm none of the other Apostles seems to evoke; he dismisses, as an unauthentic addition of the "accomplished scribe," the declaration that Judas cared not for the poor, and was a thief; and equally disregards Our Lord's tremendous words,—"One of you is a Devil." The "accomplished scribe" is clearly a person not to be trusted!

Mr. Haweis follows in his criticisms on the Fourth Gospel Dr. Matthew Arnold, who has abundantly shown how weakly a great critic can argue when he has a foregone conclusion to prove; and how even a poet's imagination may be dulled, and his fine tact blunted, by those exceeding narrow views of Divine truth which pass for exceeding broad. We must resist the temptation to extract specimens of the objections by which it is sought to whittle away the authority, unity, and authenticity, of this wonderful Fourth Gospel, in order to show how easily they may be answered. They have been answered often enough already; but, as we have said, it is not Mr. Haweis'

manner to notice considerations hostile to his views. And his jaunty, dashing, reckless style of stating these objections will give them renewed popularity with many readers, who will relish the permission to pick and choose what they like in St. John's writings,—the “accomplished scribe” carrying the waste-paper basket.

We do not feel called to follow Mr. Haweis through his “Picture of Jesus.” It would be strange if, with such a theme, an eloquent and cultured preacher should fail to say, in his biting trenchant way, many instructive and some beautiful and noble things; and to rise now and then to a burst of genuine, if rather theatrical enthusiasm. But all is marred by the coarse vulgarising touch to which we have been compelled to refer, by the low level of view, and the lack of that good taste, delicacy, and dignity which religious reverence inspires. Still, there are no doubt readers to whom these volumes may be useful. Minds afflicted with the fixed idea of the incredibility of miracles, may welcome the *naïve* suggestion, that if you only omit the words, “with water” (to which must be added, however, the words, “the water that was made wine,” and, “who drew the water”), the miracle disappears! “What more natural,” asks Mr. Haweis, “than that Jesus, knowing the inconvenience that would result if the wine ran short, should arrange with His disciples to bring plenty of wine, taking care to bring the best, and pour it into *the host's own pots!*” The little circumstance that the pots contained from 70 to over 100 gallons, does not seem to Mr. Haweis worth referring to. He is not joking. He propounds this quite gravely as “a natural explanation,” and oddly enough founds on it some caustic (and just) remarks on “our insular bigotry.”

One thing we may be sure of; such a mode of dealing with his narrative would have been more nauseous to the “Son of Thunder” himself, than downright denial. Let us have one or the other. Give us the true testimony of the Beloved Disciple, and let us believe it. Or give us the legend of “the accomplished scribe,” and let us treat it accordingly. But in the name of honesty and common



sense, do not give us such a mingle-mangle of truth and fiction, and call it "the Picture of Jesus."

We sincerely regret to have had to speak thus of the work of so eloquent and popular a clergyman of the Church of England; but regret much more that such volumes should go forth with the passport which his name will give them to popularity.

E. R. CONDER.

---

### THE ROCK TOMBS OF THEBES, AND THE SEPULCHRE OF MOSES.

DURING the brief interval of quiet in Egypt, between the bombardment of Alexandria and the Soudan Expedition, a few of the Khedive's steamers were chartered for Nile travellers, in the last of which I ascended the river as far as Nubia and the First Cataract. Our vessel, the *Mehalah*, had accommodation for thirty passengers. She was afterwards employed to convey troops, and was stranded in one of the upper rapids.

On the evening of the eighth day after leaving Cairo, we anchored off the Temple of Luxor, over which the British flag was flying, as the English Consul had his residence in one of its porticos. On the left bank we caught a glimpse of the columns of the Great Hall at Karnak, and on the right rose the red Libyan Mountains, enclosing the green plain with its background of desert. Our little vessel was moored to the shore of the Nile, in company with several smaller craft and Lady Brassey's dahabeah. As we sat round the table after dinner—a goodly company of Americans and English—our dragoman entered, to give us the programme for the morrow's excursion. Mahomet, for that was his name, was a splendid Arab—over six feet high, with fine open countenance, and an intelligent expression; he looked, in his white turban and flowing robe, a model son of Ishmael. Clapping his hands, after the custom of the East, to secure attention, he made his announcement thus:

"Ladies and Gentlemen, to-morrow morning, first bell ring at seven o'clock, breakfas at haf-pas seven. At eight o'clock Mahomet haf the very bes donkey in all Egypt for every one of you, ladies first. You shall go to the Demble of Thothmes and the Doombs of the Kings. Dere you shall see the judgment of Osiris, and Mahomet will explain it all, and will show you the cooks and the harpers and people shust as they were alife. At dwelve o'clock, Lonch at the Doomb of one King. At four o'clock come back de steamer. Whom wish to walk over de mountain, him to walk; whom wish to come on Donkey wid Mahomet, him come."

There was in this, as in all our Nile experiences, an odd mixture of the modern tourist element with its humorous associations, and of Oriental customs, and ancient scenes, which touched thoughts too deep for tears or laughter. The centuries are brought together in a strange way when your steamer is moored to the ruins of a temple that Moses may have known, and the halls of Karnak echo to its shrill whistle.

As the sun went down that evening behind the Libyan hills, we were full of expectation as to what the morrow should bring; for were we not on the threshold of wonders such as no other part, even of Egypt itself, can boast. We had no anxiety, however, as to the weather; the Nile traveller rarely has. To address your neighbour with the remark that, "It is a fine day," would be to use a salutation unvaried in its monotony. The clear atmosphere and dry air of the desert in February is as balmy as a June morning, and as bracing as a January frost.

The Nile at Luxor widens considerably, and where we crossed it the breadth could not be less than a mile. The channel of the river was divided by a large sand bank. There first the boatmen landed us, and we mounted our donkeys and crossed the sand to embark again. The water being shallow, we had all to submit to being carried ignominiously to the boats twenty yards away, to the great amusement of a crowd of Arabs. Safely landed, we mounted our donkeys, and, in long single file, picked our way along

the dry bed of a water-course, or the uneven banks of the river. Soon we struck off to the left, passing through fields of lentils and barley, white already unto harvest. In the midst of these fields stand two gigantic statues, one of which is the "vocal Memnon." The figures are seated, with their arms resting on their thighs and their hands open upon their knees. This, to us, unaccustomed attitude expresses great calmness and repose, and characterizes all the statues of the kings to whatever dynasty they belong. These imposing figures are seventy feet in height, and once stood before a palace which has entirely disappeared. They alone remain of an avenue of eighteen similar statues. As they stand out in relief against the background of rock and mountain, with their faces turned towards the Nile, and Karnak on its further shore, they seem, in their majestic calmness, to be unconscious of all the ruins and fragments strewn behind.

After passing the Colossi, we turned to enter the valley out of whose rocky sides are excavated the Tombs of the Kings. Dean Stanley calls this spot the "Westminster Abbey of Thebes;" but indeed, it was more, for princes, priests, and kings, for upwards of five hundred years, were buried here with rites which were splendid beyond comparison, and which give us insight into the religious faith of the Egyptians. While Karnak, with its forest of sculptured columns, speaks of the might of the Pharaohs as they lived; the tomb-grottoes tell us of their faith in a future life and judgment after death. Ascending the rocky gorge, we came upon a scene of utter desolation. The track may be truly called the pathway of the dead. Not a blade of grass, or sign of vegetation, or trace of living thing, was to be seen. All is sad and gloomy, as if fire had seathed the hills and split the rocks. In its winding course the valley shuts out all view of the river, and we were enclosed in the awful solitude and desolation which must ever have characterized this spot. We were in the steps of those funeral processions which had for ages come up the valley, causing the cliffs to re-echo with "great and sore lamentations." To this spot the kings of

"Thebes of the Hundred Gates" were brought across the Nile in the sacred boat, that they might "lie in glory, every one in his own house" (Isa. xiv. 18)—with all the insignia of royalty and the symbols of religion.

The heat began to be oppressive as we rode along up the ravine, and we were glad to dismount from our patient beasts, and prepare to enter one of the tombs. Mahomet had provided us all with candles, and with these and the aid of Bengal lights which he now and then burnt, we were able to explore the dark recesses with ease. In common with other travellers, we found that the vastness and grandeur of the royal tombs far exceeded our expectations.

Passing through a portal in the face of the cliff, we found ourselves in a long and lofty gallery opening into successive chambers, whose walls were covered with paintings in colours as fresh and vivid as when the artist's hand left them 4,000 years ago.

These sepulchres are in reality more like rock-hewn palaces, for no banqueting halls could be decorated with more brilliant or elaborate designs. On the other side of the Nile, amidst the ruins of Karnak, we had seen endless bas-reliefs of the battles by sea and land which the mighty Pharaohs had fought and won over numerous and strange enemies. There Rameses, gigantic in stature, is depicted, now sitting in royal majesty, now riding in his chariot over the bodies of the slain, now on foot, grasping his foes by their hair while he smites them with his falchion. But the tomb-pictures transport us into another world where Pharaoh's greatness is no more supreme and his enemies no longer of the flesh. We read here, as from the pages of an open book, what the religion of Egypt taught as to death and the judgment to come. The "Ritual of the Dead," with its anticipations of immortality and retribution, is before us. Strange, weird, fantastic figures abound. Long serpents stand erect at the door-way to guard the entrance. Endless processions of jackal, ape, and hawk-headed, winged deities file past. There are serpents with human heads, and spirits with wings of blue and red hover over the mummies of the dead, while disembodied wicked souls

are seen entering animals to begin their earthly life again in degradation.

It is perhaps impossible correctly to interpret the significance of all the strange figures, and fully to trace the details of the creed which they symbolize ; but here and there we see clear and unmistakable representations of a future day of judgment. The pictures on the wall tell us what was the belief of the greatest personages in the land in the most solemn moments of their lives, as far back as the days when Joseph "gave commandment concerning his bones."

Whatever may have been the reason why Moses refrained from appealing in the law to motives derived from future rewards and punishments, it could not have been that he was ignorant of the doctrine, for he had been instructed "in all the wisdom of Egypt."

"After death, the judgment," is written as manifestly on the rock tombs of Egypt as on the pages of Scripture.

Mahomet will now fulfil his promise, and as we gather round him, with our thirty candles, he points to a group of figures on the wall, and we see the judging of the departed spirit before Osiris, the presiding deity of the dead. The judge, "the prince of eternity," is seated on his throne, as we have seen him on the sculptured walls of Thebes and Karnak. He wears the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt ; his arms are crossed upon his breast, in one hand is his shepherd's crook, and in the other a scourge, intimating that he is willing to lead and guide as a shepherd those who obey, and ready to punish with heavy strokes the wilful and disobedient. Before him the scales of justice are erected, presided over by Anubis, human in form, with jackal head, guardian of Hades. Thoth, the god of writing, stands by with tablet in hand to record the issue of the trial, and present it to Osiris. On the top of the balance there is the emblem of time and law. In one scale is a vase containing the heart of the deceased, typifying character and moral worth. In the other scale is either a figure of Truth, or an ostrich feather. It may seem a grim satire upon a king's virtues to weigh them against such a trifle, but the ostrich feather was with them the emblem

of rectitude, and thus they expressed their belief that the judgment to come would be according to truth and without respect of persons.

If, being weighed, the soul was "found wanting," it was rejected by Osiris, and condemned to torments, or to begin life anew in the body of an unclean animal. If, however, the heart out-weighed the feather, the departed was received into eternal joy.

Dean Stanley remarks in "Sinai and Palestine," that the mythology of Egypt can only be studied in the caverns of the Valley of the Kings, as there are so few engravings of the Tombs. When we were there agents of the French Government were making casts in *papier maché* of some of the sculptures which may soon be published. Any one interested in the matter may see on the walls of the staircase of the British Museum, leading to the upper Egyptian room some illuminated papyrus rolls which are worthy of more attention than they usually receive. They are the "Ritual of the Dead," and with varying details represent scenes similar to those depicted on the Theban Tombs.

In the Pyramids of Lower Egypt there are various chambers and blind passages running both up and down which Egyptologists conclude to have been constructed to deceive would-be violators of the sepulchre, by throwing them off the scent as to the actual depository of the royal dead. In like manner every precaution was taken to conceal the entrances of the Tombs at Thebes. When the mummy was committed to its resting-place the external rock was replaced so as to leave no trace of the sepulchre. Grandeur and secrecy were unmistakably the chief objects kept in view in every royal interment. For ages the secret was inviolate, and the royal dead lay undisturbed in their painted chambers, richly adorned with jewels and amulets.

About twelve centuries \* before the Christian era, however, there was a period of poverty and discontent in the land, during which many of the tombs were pillaged. It

\* See "Recent Archaic Discoveries in Egypt," by Sir Erasmus Wilson.

was thought indeed that in this way nearly all the royal mummies were lost. But, so recently as July, 1881, it was discovered that friendly hands, probably those of priests had shielded the sacred remains of the great kings by removing them privately to a secluded rock tunnel nearly 500 feet in length. This place of hiding amongst the hills was accidentally laid bare four years ago, and now the veritable mummy of Rameses II., the Pharaoh who oppressed the Israelites, together with the remains of other renowned kings, may be seen in the Boulak Museum at Cairo.

After exploring several of the Tombs, we rode up the valley which terminates in a huge pyramidal mountain, and, led by our guide, we climbed the rocks to the left that we might cross its shoulder and regain the river by another route. Standing on the summit of the ridge and looking beyond the margin of green which marked the extent of the irrigated land, we could discern Karnak with its gateways—while at our feet were the colossal remains of a civilization reaching back to the age of Joseph and Moses.

Amongst the undesigned coincidences between the Scripture and ancient history, the allusions in the Pentateuch to the splendid funeral rites of the Egyptians are noteworthy.

Modern research gives special emphasis to the faith of Joseph, who, "dying, gave commandment concerning his bones." His embalmed body might have found a resting-place in this same valley amongst the nobles and princes of the land, but he declined that coveted distinction, and thus gave signal evidence that the hope of the Israelite was dearer to him than the honours of Egypt.

Fresh light is also thrown upon the mystery which enshrouds the burial of Moses by the knowledge now attained of the pomp which attended the interments of the great and noble in Egypt, and the secrecy which was deemed so essential. The obscure passage in Jude, in which mention is made of a contention between Michael and Satan, "about the body of Moses," has been explained by the supposition that Satan desired to possess the body of the Lawgiver that he might present it to the people as an

object of idolatrous worship. But this interpretation is unsatisfactory, for at no time do we find that the Jews regarded the relics of the dead with superstitious homage. It was no part of that Egyptian idolatry, to which they were so prone to recur, to worship the mummies of kings or priests. Indeed, there is no reference to such homage in the sculptures of ancient Egypt, nor in the Bible.

A more probable explanation of the difficulty may perhaps be found in the supposition that Satan desired to discredit the honour given to God's servant, by rifling his tomb and casting forth his remains.

Be this as it may, in his death Moses was distinguished in a manner which would be very impressive to the Hebrews. In refusing to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter he was not without his reward in life and honour in death. The grandeur and pomp of an Egyptian funeral, which might have been his, were eclipsed by his more than regal obsequies. In impenetrable secrecy God "buried him in a valley in the land of Moab," and, "no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." The great Rameses spared neither labour nor wealth to provide for himself a tomb which should be worthy of his fame.

Cheops, on the borders of the desert, at Memphis, reared the great pyramid, and with cunningly devised passages sought to hide his sarcophagus. The chamber which contained it has been violated, as well as the secret Tombs of Thebes, and the seal of mystery has been broken; but the prophet's grave in Moab is known to none but God.

A. D. PHILPS.

---

#### HOW BLIND CHINESE BEGGARS MAY BE TRANS- FORMED INTO MISSIONARY SCRIPTURE READERS.

From a recent volume of *Travels in China* we gathered interesting details of the very remarkable manner in which Mr. W. H. Murray, a Bible colporteur at Peking, has



succeeded in reducing the perplexing sounds of the Chinese language to a reading system so simple as to be easily mastered by any blind beggar of average intelligence (and of such there are legions in every city of that vast Empire).

In China, where everything connected with literature commands such extraordinary respect, and where, to acquire the art of reading an ordinary book, involves years of toil for the student with the full use of his eyes—it is evident that the interest excited by fluent Bible readers, who, but a few weeks previously, were familiar objects as miserable beggars, may advantageously be employed as a most valuable agent in mission work—the blind reader becoming the companion of the colporteur.\*

Hitherto Mr. Murray has taxed his own limited resources to the uttermost, for the maintenance of a very small number of blind pupils, but it is time that a system capable of being turned to such valuable account as a mission agency should be developed as a permanent institution. Mr. Murray therefore hopes, during a short stay in England, to secure a sufficient number of ANNUAL SUBSCRIBERS to warrant his establishing a Training School for the Blind in Peking on a larger scale than he has hitherto attempted. It is hoped that eventually Branch Institutes may be opened in Southern cities (the dialects in various parts of China being so different as to necessitate the publication of seven different translations of the Holy Scriptures, besides five published in Roman character. Consequently special versions would have to be prepared for the blind of those separate districts, ere they could read for the edification of the unlearned multitudes in other provinces).

Meanwhile, however, it is much to be desired that such a fund may be raised as shall secure a moderate permanent endowment for the school at Peking; and the first donation for this purpose comes from "A Working Woman," who says that, as the development of so valuable a mission agency is evidently worth a very special effort, she wishes to devote to this purpose £100, saved from her earnings,

\* The system is fully described in *Wanderings in China*. By C. F. GORDON CUMMING. (Messrs. Blackwood.)

which she forwards in the hope that nine other persons will each send a similar sum, or that eighteen will each send, or undertake to collect, £50.

For the sake of so excellent a work, it is much to be hoped that not only will the NINE thus challenged come forward, but that the £1,000 thus aimed at may be more than doubled, so that there may always be a sure income of at least £100 as provision for the hire of a small house, a modest salary for a permanent teacher, and a sum sufficient for the maintenance of at least half-a-dozen indigent blind students, who year by year may be sent forth to read the Sacred Message in the streets of Peking, and other great heathen cities.

Such a project must surely enlist the sympathy of all who are interested either in the blind or in Christian missions (and who that rightly values his own blessings of SIGHT and LIGHT can fail to sympathize with both?) We all know, however, how often a warm interest fails to attain to GIVING-POINT (which is very much like bringing a kettle up to BOILING-POINT—quite a different stage from mere heat!) And we also know how very apt we are to limit our giving-power to such a sum as we can spare without involving much self-denial.

Would that some who read these lines could be induced to consider for a moment what life would be to them were they deprived of these two great gifts, and then each resolve to present for this branch of God's work such a sum as they shall really miss—not taken from the total of their accustomed offerings, but as a special thankoffering for these precious gifts—an annual tribute of the money-talent which we know we only hold in trust, as we so often need to remind ourselves when we say, "Both riches and honour come from THEE, and of THINE own do we give THEE."

The fact that we are all suffering from hard times seems a special reason for practically testing God's promise in Malachi iii. 10, "PROVE ME NOW." We have to remember that, as purest paper is produced from seemingly worthless rags, so the wretched blind beggars of Peking form the raw material to be transformed into useful members of society,

and as they have hitherto been entirely dependent on alms, it is of course necessary to provide them with board and lodging during their course of training, and even a Chinese blind student cannot be maintained for less than £10 a year.

Donations and subscriptions for this good object will be gladly received by WILLIAM J. SLOWAN, Esq., Secretary, National Bible Society of Scotland, 224, West George Street, Glasgow.

---

#### LORD SHAFTESBURY'S BIOGRAPHY.\*

THE three portly volumes in which the story of Lord Shaftesbury's life is told may not be too much for the subject, but they certainly wear a somewhat formidable appearance to the ordinary reader in an age when the demand for brevity and sensationalism is only too apt to produce a superficial treatment of all subjects. We should, however, be extremely loth to say that Mr. Edwin Hodder has occupied too much space. It must be remembered that Lord Shaftesbury's was not only a very long life, but a very long life spent in public. For more than half a century he was more or less before the world, always as a conspicuous and interesting figure. His Dorsetshire contest and the subsequent petition take us back to the era of the first Reform Bill, and yet little more than a year ago he was still in our midst, his natural force no doubt abated, but still taking a lively interest in his own favourite subjects. It must be added, too, that he was, if not exactly a many-sided man, yet one of so much activity that he was continually engaged in a number of movements, all of which brought him into a wide and varied circle of acquaintances and friends. He had political friends, friends among the working men, for whom he so gallantly struggled; friends in the many philanthropic societies of which

\* *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.* By EDWIN HODDER. Three Vols. (Cassell and Company.)

he was so active a promoter; and last, but not least, either in number or interest, friends in "at "great Evangelical party" of which he was so long the centre. In all these relations questions of importance were continually arising which were referred to him for advice. He was a man of leading to a much greater extent than would be supposed by those who looked only at his intellectual strength. For many years, and all of them years of intense excitement and stir, he was one of the greatest moral and spiritual forces in our society. It would not have been easy to condense the story of his life into small compass. It may be said with truth that if the biography of an excellent nobleman, who cannot be said even by the most partial friends to have played a prominent part in the history of the times, is to extend to three octavos, the multiplication of books will become a positive nuisance. The answer would be that Lord Shaftesbury, though occupying a subordinate position in politics, exercised a more widespread, and certainly a more beneficent, influence on the condition of the English than any political leader of his times, unless we are to except Mr. Gladstone. Since the time when he took up the cause of the over-taxed workers in factories, we have been passing through a social revolution, the end of which has not yet been reached, and in relation to which he might truly say *cupis pars magna fui*. The story of such a life deserves telling, and telling with considerable minuteness.

Whether it has been well told is, of course, another question, with another still behind it, whether, if there are defects, they ought to be attributed to Mr. Edwin Hodder or to the instructions under which he acted. It is no reflection on the writer to say that the biography will not take rank with such a book as Trevelyan's life of his uncle, for that would only be to say that Mr. Hodder is not a heaven-sent biographer. The class is very small, and it is surely no reproach to any man that he is not of that select circle. But if there be not this transcendent excellence, on the other hand there are no glaring faults. Our own idea is that the arrangement might have been improved. But we

freely recognize the difficulty. It may seem easy to group the various incidents under distinct headings, but it is only necessary to make the attempt in order to learn how deceptive such an appearance is. Lord Shaftesbury was a politician, a philanthropist, and a religious leader; and the first, and perhaps most natural, idea, would be that he should be regarded in these characters separately. But, unfortunately for an arrangement which seems so obvious, these different characters are so closely interlaced that it is all but impossible to divide the story of one from that of the others. Besides, we know not to what extent the biographer was free to exercise his own discretion. We can easily conceive that a shorter and more popular narrative may be written from the materials here gathered together. But it was impossible that this condensation could be exercised in the original biography. The world wants to know more of such a man than could be given in any summary of the kind. Mr. Hodder has at all events the rare merit of perfect candour. This is a life, and not a mere panegyric. Lord Shaftesbury is left to paint a portrait of himself, and the frank and unconscious revelations of character which are scattered everywhere through the story are one of its principal charms, and, it need not be added, indefinitely enhance its value.

We have been deeply interested in the record of Lord Shaftesbury's early days. It is touching in itself, and it goes far to explain that air of subdued melancholy which always impressed us in him, as well as that passionate sympathy with suffering, and especially with the sufferings of children, which was one of the moving influences of his life. Though the son of an Earl, his childhood was singularly sad. He was, in truth, neglected by those whose primary duty it was to care for him, and the gloom which was thus engendered did not pass away when the immediate cause ceased. But, in fact, he can have had but little joy in life until he found it in that career of honourable and benevolent activity which he struck out for himself. His father did not understand him. There seems little evidence that he cared for him. For many years they

were estranged, the father having no sympathy with the work by which the son was not only earning golden opinions for himself, but was making the hearts of many a child of sorrow to rejoice. How far this separation from the father and son may have developed a morbid spirit it would be rash for us to say. That he felt, and felt keenly, is beyond possibility of doubt. Of this there is indeed sufficient evidence in the reference to the reconciliation which is preserved in the diary which forms so large and valuable a part of the biography. The two men evidently had little in common. The father who did so little to brighten the childhood of his own son could not have any sympathy with that son's enthusiasm of humanity. Equally, of course, Lord Ashley could not consent to abandon the work to which he felt God had called him. The result was an estrangement which extended over years. How deeply the iron had gone into Lord Ashley's soul is evident from the touching way in which he speaks of his first visit to the old home.

I can hardly believe myself or my senses ; here I am in St. Giles's, reconciled to my father, and actually receiving from him ardent and sincere marks of kindness and affection ! Who would have thought, not I at least, when I quitted this house *ten* (!) years ago, that I should never return to it until I came a married man with six children ! But it is a blessed thing that it has happened at last ; a thing good for him and good for me ; a thing for which I ought, and for which I do, thank God most heartily. He is now an old man, and it would have been a sad and terrible matter had he died otherwise than in peace with his children ; but, God be praised, we are reconciled, and his heart and mine are lighter. His amiableness is wonderful ; he puts himself, as the phrase is, to sixteens to find ways of giving us pleasure. . . . It cannot be disguised, I do enjoy being here ; it is very natural, and not criminal, to derive profound and sincere pleasure from a restoration of long-omitted pursuits, long-denied affections, and long-desired scenes ; but experience and matured life, and God's grace, teach me to "rejoice with trembling."

The idea of Lord Shaftesbury which we get here is one that is continually brought out in these volumes. He was every inch an English nobleman—fully sensible of the dignity of his position, and resolved to maintain it—with

many of the prejudices of his order, although with more than an average share of its virtues. His exquisite enjoyment of the old family seat, his keen susceptibility to all the home influences, his appreciation of the advantages of his position, were eminently characteristic of the man. But these feelings did not interfere with the flow of that genial philanthropy which gave him the unique place which he held among the men of his time.

Mr. Hodder has probably done wisely in devoting a comparatively small space to the political career of Lord Shaftesbury. It is true that the part he played in the politics of the time was not altogether insignificant, though far less prominent and influential than his unquestionable talents would have warranted. When we think of some of the men who held high office during his life, it seems surprising that the most important position he ever held was the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster. But it must be added that this was due to his own action, and is to his lasting honour. He sacrificed the prize of ambition that he might do better service in that cause of humanity which always lay so close to his heart. Sir Robert Peel, under whom he held subordinate office in his early days, and afterwards Lord Derby, would gladly have had him as a colleague in the Cabinet, and Palmerston had more than once employed all the influence he could command, which of course was very considerable, to induce him to take office before he fairly succeeded in persuading him.

His reluctance seems to us perfectly natural. His Lordship was constitutionally unfitted for political intrigue, and we should fancy would have found himself little at home in the life either of the Court or the Cabinet. So far, indeed, as the former was concerned, the passionate loyalty which was so conspicuous in him would have enabled him to endure a good deal which would not have been congenial to him. There are few entries in his journal which have surprised us more than one relative to Ascot races. He went to these races in 1828, but at that time does not appear to have been troubled with any scruple of conscience re-

specting them, but as he travelled along he meditated on the grandeur of the British Empire. "On earth," he writes in the Diary, "we are lords of the sea, and should we, as men, as Christians, regenerate India, behold, the Heaven of Heavens will be the archive of our fame. *O patria! O divum domus!*" The religious feeling was awakening in him, but it had not yet attained the strength which it afterwards possessed. In 1841 it was different. He had come to disapprove of the racing system, as well he might when we remember the widespread gambling with which it is associated. Yet he still went to Ascot.

June 8, Windsor Castle. Arrived here last night. . . . I find we are invited for the race: t Ascot—I am sorry for it, but I cannot refuse to go there, I am the Queen's guest, and I cannot think it right to put upon my sovereign such a rebuke as would be conveyed by my declining to accompany her. I wish to avoid and discountenance races, and I do not like to add the value of my example (such as it is) to aid the maintenance of the practice; but the thing is not wrong in itself, simply in its consequences. I shall acquiesce, therefore, in this instance, and pray God it may not be productive of any mischief in the slight influence I may have in the world for carrying forward measures and designs of good to mankind.

Lord Shaftesbury was certainly not conscious of the sophistical character of a plea which reminds us very much of the appeal of Naaman to Elisha that his compliance with the will of his sovereign when he bowed in the house of Rimmon might be forgiven him. We believe that his Lordship was perfectly honest, and that he was influenced by an excessive loyalty. But no such feeling would have reconciled him to the tortuous courses of political or diplomatic intrigue. He was, indeed, a keen partizan, and a partizan who could hate with a fair amount of intensity, but he had qualities which would have made a very difficult Member in a Cabinet. He had a higher sense of his personal claims than we were prepared to find, and though he continually subordinated these to party or patriotic considerations, they might at some awkward moment have caused trouble. More difficult still would have been his religious or philanthropic views, which could not easily be reconciled with party policy.



It has sometimes been a matter of dispute whether he was a Liberal or a Tory; but we cannot see how any doubt can remain in the mind of the readers of this volume. By birth, association, prejudice, and conviction he was a Tory. Indeed he had no patience with the opposite side, and appears to have been constitutionally incapable of looking fairly at the arguments by which it was supported, or forming any impartial judgment of its advocates. His intense dogmatism was sometimes pushed to such a point as to become almost ludicrous, and yet it was one secret of his power. His unmeasured language expressed the fervour of his own convictions, and if one was sometimes amused that so fierce an opponent of Papal infallibility should be so implicit a believer in the infallibility of the Protestant layman, it is not to be denied that the very force of his utterances had its influence on the unthinking masses, while the faith by which they were inspired was a support to his own mind. We are told by his biographer: "There were occasions when Lord Shaftesbury's speeches were brilliant 'orations,' when the whole man flashed fire, and the words flowed in a rapid torrent of eloquence; when he felt that as such mighty issues were at stake, unless he threw all his heart and soul and strength into the subject with passionate earnestness, the whole cause would be lost." This may possibly be a somewhat partial view; but it is so far true that the oratory of Lord Shaftesbury was in fact the oratory of passion rather than persuasion. It was the very opposite to that of Richard Cobden, and yet in both of them was an equal element of earnestness. Cobden, however, could understand the strong points of an opponent—an achievement to which Lord Shaftesbury was wholly unequal.

The remarkable point is that a conspicuous leader in great social reforms, which were almost revolutionary in their tendencies, should have been so singularly Conservative in all his ideas. The very thought of change was to him an abomination. It is very curious to note his pessimist prophecies (sometimes followed by an honest confession that they had proved untrue), his views of

principles and movements to which he was opposed, which are in fact nothing better than mere caricatures; above all, his remarks on the men from whom he differed. The limits of our space prevent us from quoting illustrative passages. Suffice it to say that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, especially the latter, were objects of his strong aversion; the first, at the outset on religious, but afterwards on political grounds also, the dislike being fomented by Palmerston; the second, because of his opposition to the Factory Acts, and because of his identification with the Manchester School. In short, Lord Shaftesbury was always a Tory in principle, but his heart made him one of the most practical of Liberals. It was curious to hear him talking Radicalism without being conscious of it. The fact was, his broad sympathies overbore the influence of training, association, and prejudice. He looked very jealously on the successive Reform Bills by which the centre of political power was entirely shifted; but he did more for the real emancipation and elevation of the people than all these measures put together.

Nothing has surprised us more in this narrative than the signs of a morbid tendency to self-depreciation. Take as an example the following reflections on the results of his career up to the time of his leaving the Commons:

Power and patronage. Confess I should have desired both, believing (but how terrible and deep is self-deception!) that I should have, through faith and prayer, exercised power well, and patronage to the welfare of important interests, and to the honour and comfort of good men. But I have obtained neither; have never held any post in which I could act on my own authority; nor ever have I had the disposal of a single place, either ecclesiastical or civil.

Influence and fame. "Your influence," "Your commanding influence," &c., &c., I am constantly hearing, but never experiencing. In a long public life I have obtained three cadetships and one surgeon's appointment for the sons of deserving men; one living from Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, and a commissionership in Lunacy from Lord Chancellor Cottenham, for persons of unrivalled public merits; one, too, from Lord Carlisle for an admirable minister. Is my influence with the Government? What do I avail, and what is their treatment of me? Is it with the Peel party? I lost my political connection with them when I refused office, and urged the Factory Bill. Is it

with the Protectionists? I lost them when I supported the repeal of the Corn Laws. Is it with the manufacturers? They hate me for the Ten Hours' Act. Is it with the operatives? They forget all my labour of love in the middle course I took for their welfare. I won for them almost everything; but for the loss of that very little they regard me as an enemy! Is it with the Commons House of Parliament? Whatever I had is gone. I had once the ear of the assembly; I have it no more. Is it with the bishops? the High Church, the Tractarians? Is it with the Low Church? So it is said; but I ask the proof of it. Is it with the Press? Nearly every paper is hostile. I have had my day of favour; now I suffer the reverse. They began by reviling me: they now *ignore* me, as the phrase goes. Is it a power to raise money for charitable purposes? Why, Sidney Herbert raised, in three months, nearly as much as I have raised in my whole life. Is it with private individuals? Why, who attends to what I do, say, or think? except to mark it for cavil or reproof. Is it with my friends? Alas! how few can be trusted in the hour of trial! My curious career, too, makes me, every day, new enemies, and oftentimes alters my old friends. Is it with the rich? God knoweth. Is it with the poor? Yes, so far as a few shouts go, but no further. This is my position after twenty years of labour! I began in the hope that many of the aristocracy would first follow, then succeed me. Not one is to be found; a few, at my request, put their hands to the plough, but they looked back, and return not to the furrows.

We need not say that this is the very opposite of the truth. Lord Ashley could not have accomplished what he did for the world, and chiefly for the poor and suffering in it, had he not been content to sacrifice self. But if he could only have seen it, the Saviour's promise was even then being fulfilled to him, and he had saved his life in losing it. No public man of his generation will leave behind him a purer and nobler fame than Lord Shaftesbury. He was narrow in his sympathies and hard in his judgments; but even those who have felt the unfairness of his censures are among the first to pay their tribute of admiration and honour to his disinterested aims and lofty character. We have chosen to speak of him in an aspect which has received but little attention. Of his position as the leader of the Evangelical party we must treat in a future article.

## IS LIBERAL RE-UNION POSSIBLE ?

THE gathering of the Liberal Unionists undoubtedly marks a crisis in the politics of the day, but its true significance may easily be misunderstood. Some of the leaders seemed anxious to emphasize the proof which it afforded that they were representatives of a new party in the State. In our judgment it would be more correct to say that, so far as their influence extends, they have disintegrated all party relations. However reluctant we may be to admit it, the spirit which was manifest in most of the speeches, we might say in every one except that of Sir George Trevelyan, indicated that the reconstruction of the Liberal party on its old basis is becoming, if it has not already become, hopeless. By this we do not mean that we have parted company with all the men under whom we were recently proud to serve, but that this Home Rule question has revealed differences of opinion and tendency, which go much deeper and extend much further than the Irish policy. The temper shown by Mr. Goschen, and even by Lord Hartington in relation to Ireland, was altogether out of harmony with the spirit of Liberalism ; and those speeches accentuated as they were by the leader of *The Times*, which may fairly be taken as their principal organ in the press, showed that this temper is to inspire the whole action of the new party. With the single exception already mentioned, we seek in vain for any sign of a desire for reconciliation in the deliverances at the meeting. Mr. Chamberlain's telegram, which has been very harshly and in our view very unfairly judged in some quarters, gives a hint which, however indistinct, we gladly welcome, pointing in the direction of peace. But the value even of that must depend on the interpretation put on one of its phrases, and as for the speakers and meetings as a whole, the one object seemed to be to demand the submission of the majority of the Liberal party, and to insist that until this takes place the present schism must continue.

Let us say for ourselves, in order to show that our

attitude is not that of an extreme partizan, that we should regard it as the very height of impolicy were this attitude to be met by one equally extreme on the other side. What we desire to see is that "free conference" between the opposing leaders which Mr. Chamberlain suggests. Whether it is possible, and, if possible, whether it is likely to be attended with any advantage, must depend on the extent of preliminary agreement which could be reached. It can hardly be doubted now that among the Unionists there is a section of "Irreconcilables." Mr. Goschen is evidently of that number, and the position is one which it is pretty clear that he would occupy whatever great measure of reform might be proposed. We not only recognize his power, but we greatly honour his fidelity to his own convictions; but it is this very belief in his loyalty to conscience which makes us despair of his taking any place in the Liberal party of the future. His true place is that of the leader of enlightened Conservatism, and if he could be accepted in that character, he might do valuable service to the country. We object to him only when he describes himself as a Liberal, and claims to have a share in regulating Liberal policy. In parting with him, we should only be losing one who, while he remains in our ranks, is certain to be a source of constant division and weakness.

Whether Lord Hartington is equally hopeless is a question it is not easy to determine. His loss would be a more serious one, for while we cannot regard him with the admiration professed by some, we are not insensible to his high political qualities, or forgetful of the service he rendered the party in a time of great difficulty. We have, indeed, sometimes felt that, if he had thrown the same fervour into his opposition to Lord Beaconsfield which has marked his resistance to Mr. Gladstone, the story of the Liberal party in the dark years from 1875-78 might have worn a different aspect. We say this, not so much in censure of his former action as in support of the opinion, that we have seen more of the true man in these recent months than in the years when he was the leader of the Liberal party. We do not blame him for this, we only

wish to get at the facts. The extraordinary political changes in the last five years have necessarily changed the relations of men to their respective parties. If the first Reform Bill turned many Whigs into Tories, what may not be expected from the still more sweeping changes of the last two Bills? It is certain that the reforms of the future will have to be accomplished without the support, if not in defiance, of the stern resistance of some of the families which have been reckoned as the great leaders of Liberalism. Whether Lord Hartington will join the seceders is still problematical; but, so far as Ireland is concerned, he appears to have become more impracticable and unyielding than at first. If coercion is to be tried in Ireland, we believe that on him the responsibility will largely rest. At all events, we cannot conceive that he will enter into any conference in which the abandonment of all proposals for a statutory Parliament for Ireland is not a preliminary.

We should regard this as a serious but not an irreparable loss, and certainly not as one which should determine the action of the Liberal party. It is simply a question of time when we are to part with the old Whigs. Many of them are already gone, and of those who remain there are but few about whom we need be greatly concerned. As we look along the list of those who figured on the platform at Willis's Rooms how many do we find of those who have been the habitual and constant troublers of the party? Sherbrooke, Norwood, Heneage, Watkin, Albert Grey, Kingscote, are familiar names; but they are not names conspicuous for the service they have rendered to Liberalism. If we are to judge of the worth even of Sir John Lubbock from the state of the party in the district in which he has, unhappily for its interests, been a Liberal leader, we cannot say that the injury which Liberalism would sustain from his withdrawal would be very serious, or would be wholly without compensation. If we go outside Parliament and look at the local celebrities who figured on the platform, we see the same class of men. Mr. Wm. Oulton spoke as a representative of the leading Liberals of Liverpool, and Mr. Watson of those of Bradford; but, if we are correctly

informed, neither of these gentlemen has been an element of strength in the constituency. We have no wish to speak of them, or of politicians of their type, with disrespect, although when one of them charges Mr. John Morley, of all men in the party, with "inconsistency in his attitude with respect to Home Rule," and the other talks in violent language of branding Mr. Gladstone as a "traitor," there is a strong temptation to make our criticism severe. But we have no desire to judge them as they have judged, or mete out to them the measure they have meted to great statesmen beside whom they are but pigmies. We say only that the Liberalism which is to do real work must be made of "sterner stuff," that whenever real work had to be done they would certainly have been found wanting, and that their secession, instead of being a calamity to the party, will only help in its consolidation.

There is no good in indulging idle dreams, and therefore we would insist as earnestly as we can that we must, as easily as we can, reconcile our minds to part with a certain number of the old members of the party. We may do it with regret, but it is the inevitable; it would have been the inevitable under any circumstances, and, as wise and earnest men, it is for us frankly to accept the situation, and do our utmost to repair the breach that may be made. "There was," says *The Times*, in one of its fierce tirades on the morning after the meeting, "full recognition on all hands of the truth which we have been unwearied in proclaiming, which we rejoice to see so unequivocally accepted, that though the task of the Unionists began, or seemed to begin, in maintaining the unity of the United Kingdom, it is now enlarged to the defence of the fundamental principles of society." Precisely. All such movements are sure to extend in that direction, and alike in the attacks upon the true leaders of the Liberal party, and in the principles which they advocated as the basis of their whole action, the representatives of the Whig section made it abundantly clear that Unionism was an inclined plane, at the bottom of which was, and with no violent descent, Toryism of a somewhat extreme type.

But there are "Radical" as well as "Liberal" Unionists. The distinction has been often ignored, and, what is worse, the ground of the opposition has not been properly understood. It has been hastily assumed that Radicals who do not like Home Rule are influenced solely by personal antagonism to Mr. Gladstone, inflamed by ambition and jealousy. The judgment is unfair. While deprecating the action of Radicals who have joined hands with the Tories and sacrificed everything else to the defeat of this particular measure, we have not hesitated to maintain that they have a case against the two Bills which must be fairly considered. We need not go into it here. It is of far more importance that we should understand how far the opposition extends, and it is in this connection that Mr. Chamberlain's telegram becomes so significant. He says, "Our opposition is confined to the defeated policy. If that be frankly abandoned, we are ready to discuss any safe scheme, but must first have the assurance that the old plan, or one equally objectionable, will not be proposed. Agreement on this cardinal point necessary preliminary to any joint action. Failing this, responsibility of division rests with Separatists." In interpreting this message it is desirable if it be possible to get rid of the unpleasant impression left by the last word. We are no more Separatists than are the noble lords and gentlemen who assembled at Willis's Rooms. Nay, separation is much more likely to be the ultimate outcome of their policy than of ours. Mr. Chamberlain, if he desires a settlement, would have acted more wisely had he abstained from an offensive epithet, which proves nothing, and must cause irritation. Let us try, however, to dismiss the irritation, and look at the proposal itself. Everything turns on what is included in the "defeated policy" which must be abandoned. Does it mean the two Bills, or the principle of a "statutory Parliament"? We strongly object to this question, which is a vital one, being prejudged by the enemies of Mr. Chamberlain. Of course, if he means that all idea of a Parliament is to be given up, there is an end to any hope of reconciliation at present; and we can only trust to time and



to the teaching of events for the conversion of the followers of Mr. Chamberlain. The Liberal party could not accept such terms if it would, and it would not if it could. It stands pledged to do justice to Ireland, and unless it can be convinced that justice does not require Home Rule, it will abide by its present purpose, prepared to accept any scheme by which the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people can be satisfied without disturbing the unity of the Empire or the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, but resolute in opposing the perpetuation of the wretched policy of alternate coercing and bullying which has made Ireland a scandal and a reproach to our legislation.

There are, as we believe, a number of men on both sides who are weary of the present estrangement and anxious to see a reconciliation on any reasonable terms. It seems to us that it would be a grievous mistake to assume that even the most attached followers of Mr. Gladstone approve the utterances of Mr. Labouchere, still more that they are satisfied with the "Plan of Campaign." We must frankly say that we like the spirit of Mr. Labouchere as little as that of Mr. Jesse Collings; and as to Mr. Dillon's strategy, we condemn it as strongly as the rant about swindling and embezzlement by which its aristocratic critics have destroyed the force of their own condemnation of the proceeding. On the other hand, the Radical section of the Unionists would hardly endorse the extreme views of Mr. Goschen. On this latter point we cannot speak with the same confidence, but as to the first we have abundant evidence that in the rank and file everywhere there is a large section who would surrender anything except the principle of Home Rule and their great leader in order to effect reunion. They find themselves, especially in the southern counties, deserted by their old local leaders; and in districts where the members of great Whig families have been regarded as natural chiefs of the party, they have been subjected to humiliating defeat, and as the defection has come suddenly they are left without proper organization, and are in many cases little better than a mere mass of units. Much of this will be remedied in

time if the present situation should be continued; and where the lost leaders are Whig autocrats or plutocrats, whose one desire is to be first in aristocratic circles, it will doubtless be wise to begin the work of reorganization at once. With many of this class the Irish question has afforded a fair opportunity for abandoning a party with which they had long had little sympathy, and they will not return to the ranks. If some of them are still wavering and uncertain, they may be helped to a wise decision by being taught that they are not indispensable, but that if they fail, enlargement and deliverance will come from other hands. It is very difficult, however, for a party suddenly left without leaders to accept these views, and they are hardly likely to do so while any chance of reconciliation is left. They are hoping against hope, and therefore fail to rouse themselves to the resolution and effort necessary for the retrieval of the fallen fortunes of the party. It is needless to say that they would eagerly hail any reasonable overtures of peace.

How far this may be reciprocated on the opposite side we have no right to say. We have ourselves met strong "Unionists" who seem almost as desirous of restoring the union of the Liberal party which is really broken, as of maintaining that union with Ireland which few, if any, of the English Liberals would menace. They were, as might be expected, of the Radical section of the confederacy. We cannot say that they were less keen in their criticism of Mr. Gladstone's action or less determined to refuse all concession on the points so hotly disputed last spring, but they had a certain respect for their old chief which we do not find in the speeches of Lord Hartington or Mr. Goschen, or in the letter of Mr. Bright, and they had also, what seems also to be wanting in all these gentlemen, a sense of the injury which is being done by the paralyzed condition of the Liberal party. If we are to recover such men, and in our judgment they must be recovered, we must first try to understand their real ground of objection. It is worse than folly to persist in treating dissent from Mr. Gladstone as treason to Liberalism, or in imputing

honest difference of opinion to personal animus. It is our fixed conviction, and one which is based upon clear evidence, that the charge is not true against Mr. Chamberlain. It is, in fact, an impeachment of his common sense, as well as of his right feeling, for nothing but an infatuation which blinded his judgment altogether could have led him to abandon the certain hope of a succession to the Liberal leadership for the more than doubtful chances of an effort to displace the veteran chief. But whatever be thought of Mr. Chamberlain, it can hardly be said that this feeling affects a number of thoughtful Radicals who are opposed to the Home Rule measures of the late Government, and opposed on Radical grounds. We were talking with a man of this type recently, and his voice trembled with emotion as he spoke on the subject. "I never," he said, "believed it possible that I should forsake Mr. Gladstone." He was simply a passionate admirer of the great statesman. He had been, to some extent he is even now, his hero, and he was so far influenced by this feeling that he did not express his dislike of the Irish policy by his vote. But he was not the less decided in his opposition to the Bill. Such men are not irreconcilable, and we are bound to add that we cannot afford to part with them. Can anything be done to win back their allegiance ?

The point on which they need to be satisfied is, that whatever scheme be adopted the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament shall be preserved intact. This is the crux of the whole controversy, and we should like to see a more earnest endeavour on both sides to solve it in a satisfactory manner. We have had sufficient discussion as to the faults on both sides, but it has not brought us a point nearer to a settlement. We cannot see why the Radical "Unionists" should not produce a scheme of their own. They have rejected Mr. Gladstone's proposals ; they can scarcely be content with the policy of Lord Salisbury, or rather, perhaps, that of Lord Hartington, sustained by Mr. Bright, the practical outcome of which would be the reduction of Ireland to a Crown colony. Yet these are the only two courses at present before the country. During the election we

insisted that the only other alternative was such a modification of Mr. Gladstone's scheme as would obviate the strong objections urged against it in its original form. We are still without any suggestions pointing in this direction.

In the meantime no effort is spared to fan the intense personal feeling which has entered far too largely into the discussion. Mr. Gladstone is the object of attack on the one side, Mr. Chamberlain on the other. We protest against these miserable personalities on both sides. They belittle a great question, which ought to be settled in a patriotic spirit on the broad grounds of statesmanship. The future relations of Ireland involve far too serious results to allow of their being determined by the intrigues of the lobbies. It should have been possible to settle it by a conference of the leaders of the two great parties of the State, such as arranged the Redistribution Bill; but, if this cannot be, and the action of the Tories seems to forbid any such hope, it might at least have been thought that such a question would not have been thrown into the arena of personal rivalry. It should be the endeavour of every earnest Liberal, as well as of every true patriot, to eliminate this personal element. It can be done only by giving men credit for pure motive, and dealing with them accordingly. Very probably severe criticisms might be passed on some of their proceedings. No one has differed more strongly from Mr. Chamberlain's action than we have, but we will not, therefore, join in the indiscriminating censures of the man. We resent even more strongly the discreditable and unworthy attacks on Mr. Gladstone by men who still call themselves Liberals. We shall certainly never come together again till we have cast out of us the evil spirit of personal spite.

We do not conceal from ourselves the difficulty in the way of this arising out of the persistency with which the Liberal Unionists attack Mr. Gladstone. In a correspondence which recently appeared, Lord Hartington, with a lofty scorn, tried to put down the assertion that the one bond of union in his party was hatred of Mr. Gladstone, as undeserving of serious refutation. But in looking at the

proceedings of the late Conference, it is not easy to find any other. Mr. Bright's letter struck this key-note, and it was caught up by most of the speakers until it reached its fullest point in the tirade of Mr. Goschen about the "Gladstone-Parnell-Labouchere-Dillon-O'Brien" party. The attempt to identify Mr. Gladstone with these gentlemen may be a clever piece of strategy, but it is not a worthy one. In waging a conflict for what appear to him reasonable concessions to Nationalist demands, he has, of course, the support of Nationalists; but he does not share their counsels, nor are they to be esteemed leaders with him of the Liberal party. There is a certain shrewdness in the calculation that Mr. Gladstone and his friends will be damaged if the impression can be produced that they are so closely united with the Nationalists that they "cannot shake off the consequences, what I (Mr. Goschen) call the dire and terrible consequences, of this alliance." A certain number of people may believe that in following Mr. Gladstone they are committing themselves to some very extreme measures. But we have faith that common sense will resume its sway, and all candid men will see that these calumnies are as absurd as they are malignant. After all they are very stale. Mr. Goschen is only an echo of those who denounced Lord Grey and even Sir Robert Peel with similar passion. The situation is a very complicated one, and it is very easy for a fiery partizan to hurl all kinds of accusations against his opponents. But the Irish difficulty cannot be disposed of in this fashion. So far the dismissal of Mr. Gladstone has only resulted in confusion worse confounded, from which no relief is found in the wild harangues of excited Unionists. What they fail to understand is, that there is a strong body of independent Liberals who feel that Home Rule is a necessity. They are not insensible to its difficulties, but they feel that these must be faced, and they look to their old leaders to strike out some method for meeting them. Of course that is a work which can be undertaken only by those who accept the one fundamental proposition. Those who rave in the most approved and extreme Tory fashion, and impute to their old friends, including their great chief, all

kinds of revolutionary projects, have clearly cast off Liberalism. But there are others of a different temper, and we may hope that they will pause before they go further on the dangerous path on which they have entered, and will yet help their old chief to settle a problem as difficult as statesman ever had to confront. To sum up in one sentence. With good temper, in oblivion of past charges and recriminations, and a resolute determination to combine for the advance of a common Liberalism, the reunion of all true Liberals is possible, and for it we shall steadily work.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

We rejoice to see Congregationalists taking their full part in the arduous work of Christian charity in this great metropolis. Mr. Reaney's article in *The Fortnightly Review* for December is a valuable contribution to a better understanding of the whole subject from one who has thrown himself heart and soul into the work, and has had considerable opportunities of observation. Our friend will do much nobler service in this department than by entangling himself in hopeless agitation about "Church Reform," which would be equally distasteful to earnest Churchmen and zealous Nonconformists, inasmuch as it would sacrifice everything to preserve the Establishment. We heartily agreed with him in his manly protest against the shameless extravagance of the Lord Mayor's baby show and the banquet which followed, an extravagance all the more striking because of the circumstances of the time. It is never wise for wealth to mock poverty, especially in times of extreme depression, with such a display of the fripperies and follies of its luxury.

---

The noble, practical work done by Mr. Mearns and his devoted partner is beginning to attract the admiration it so well deserves. *The Christian World* was prompt to recog-

nize and foremost to help the movement. Now *The Pall Mall Gazette* has an article on what, in characteristic style, it calls "The Clothieries," which is the depôt which Mrs. Mearns has established for the reception and distribution of clothing amongst the poor. It was established three years ago, and it is calculated that if each article be valued at eighteenpence, the monetary worth of the whole would be £6,834. On the importance of this work comment would be unnecessary.

The distribution of the clothing, it is well to note, is marked by strict impartiality and unsectarianism, and all the distressed districts of London share proportionally. Of course, all applications are most carefully investigated, either by Mrs. Mearns through her agents, or the local committees which undertake the distribution of bales of clothing; but to be in favour at "The Clothieries," applicants must be deserving as well as needy. "Oh, yes, we find them very grateful indeed," reports Mrs. Mearns concerning the recipients. There is already this season great competition for garments. "I think there will be more distress than last year," answers Mrs. Mearns to an inquiry as to the prospect for the winter; "we have more applications than usual at this early period, and the number of applications which are reluctantly preferred show that many decent families are at last driven to the wall." "Nothing comes amiss to us here—we find an application for everything—even for dress coats, which go to hard-up waiters," is the reminder of Mr. Mearns, sen. "There are so many waiting for the clothes, it does not take us long to consider where they shall go."

---

The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes is infusing new life into Methodism. One of his latest ideas is the amalgamation of the various branches of the Methodist family, and he is pursuing his object with a resolution, a sagacity and zeal, which are worthy of the highest praise. For ourselves, from the bottom of our heart, we wish him the success which he so well deserves. Of course the result would be an immense accession to the strength of Methodism. But we should regard that neither with anxiety nor jealousy. Granted that the Methodist Church would then be the most powerful of the Free Churches of the country, that does not trouble us. The real strength of Congregationalism is never fully appreciated because we do not sufficiently insist upon the fact that Baptist and Pædo-Baptist Congre-

gational Churches are identical in polity, and that it is only by considering their united strength that we can form a correct estimate of the power of Congregationalism. Happily the tendencies are all to union of heart and effort between the two denominations, though there may be no present prospect of actual amalgamation. We have, however, little interest in this mere sectarian rivalry, and even though Methodism should surpass Congregationalism in the numbers of its adherents in consequence of the proposed union, we shall hail with gratitude the consolidation of its forces. The arguments in favour of the union appear to us to be irresistible. As to any practical difficulties which may exist, we are incompetent to pronounce an opinion. But it is evident to every observer, that the present division causes a melancholy waste of strength, all of which is absolutely needed for the evangelization of the country. We understand the objections that some feel to great ecclesiastical organizations of any kind. But the dangers which they are supposed to threaten are minimized when the controlling power is in the hands of the people themselves. Even in the Wesleyan body itself there has of late years been a marked development of the popular element; and while this has prepared the way for the contemplated union, it has neutralized the peril with which it might otherwise have been attended. Happily the spirit of the times is strongly opposed to those petty divisions which have so seriously interfered with the extension of true godliness. Just as the grandeur of our work is realized, will the transcendent value of the vital truths on which we are agreed be more deeply felt, and good men will become impatient of the time and energy wasted in discussions about the comparative trifles which have been elevated into points of importance. The Free Churches of England generally are, we hope, beginning to realize that the competitions that have estranged men and communities who have common perils, common duties, and common responsibilities, which at best they but inadequately discharge, are not only suicidal, but involve a treason to that Divine Master whose



glory should be the paramount object of consideration for all. It is impossible, it is undesirable, that there should be one great visible Christian confederation. But if we cannot thus be welded into one, we should at least be able to work side by side in perfect harmony. The union of the various sections of the Methodist family will be one step in this direction, and we shall watch with great interest the progress of a movement from which we anticipate much good. Methodism is a mighty spiritual force in this country, and if it be strengthened, the effect upon all our churches will, we believe, be most healthful and beneficial.

---

The Bishop of Manchester is able, zealous, and industrious, and we certainly do not complain of his devotion to the Established Church, of which he is a prelate. On the contrary, the wonder would rather be if he or any other bishop were lacking in attachment to an institution which gives him so exalted a position. But even the most ardent friends of the Establishment may reasonably doubt whether his zeal has not outrun his judgment. The circumstances of his position were somewhat peculiar. He is the successor of a man who, perhaps beyond any bishop of his day, commanded the respect, and even the affection, of Nonconformists. It was not that he ever faltered in his loyalty to his Church, or failed to speak out strongly in opposition to the Liberation Society. In one of his Episcopal charges he devoted considerable attention to an exposure of the faults of its advocates, which showed a sensitiveness to criticism on the State Church for which many of his Nonconformist admirers were hardly prepared. But no one honoured him the less on that account. He was a thoroughly Christian opponent, as courteous in spirit as he was trenchant in argument. It is certainly to be regretted, therefore, that Dr. Moorhouse should, so early in his career, have thought it wise and seemly to indulge in observations which the Nonconformists of the district felt to be insulting to them. We have failed to get the text of the speech; but

this is perhaps of less importance, since the bishop says that he was not fairly reported, and has given an account of his deliverance which must be accepted as expressing his intention. If the explanation was meant to remove any unpleasant feelings, we cannot congratulate his lordship on his success.

Here are the words of his charge :—

I was unfortunate enough some time ago to give offence to certain of the Nonconformists by some words which I spoke at a small village in this diocese. Nothing could have been further from my intention. My words were, I am sorry to say, very incorrectly reported, and they were spoken at so remote a place that I never expected to see them reported at all. That they should have excited such bitter feeling, and have provoked such asperity of comment, has astonished no one so much as myself. I never even hinted that in point of learning, or piety, or ability, the clergy of the Church of England possessed any advantage over their Nonconformist brethren, but only that their position as ministers of a National Church might perhaps excite feelings of jealousy in the breast of their brethren of other communions. Now, I said, in continuation, I hoped that if that supposition were correct, the clergy of the Church of England would do all in their power to efface such an impression by their personal bearing.

A bishop who could speak thus, understands neither the principle of the Nonconformist contention, nor the feelings which inspire the struggle for religious equality. *The Times*, indeed, which describes his lordship as “refreshingly candid and outspoken,” seems to think that Nonconformists ought rather to be grateful for the liberality he shows :—

Not unreasonably (it says), as a bishop, he considers that the Establishment tends to enhance the professional merits of its ministers. With wise liberality, he would like other religious communities to participate in the benefits. Indirectly his view necessarily *suggests inferiority in the whole of the ministries which insist upon staying outside*. It is entirely compatible with the recognition of extraordinary goodness and greatness in any number of individual Dissenters.

If the Nonconformist ministers of Manchester, who protested against the bishop's lofty assumptions, needed any confirmation of the correctness of the interpretation they put upon his words, they have it here. We commend to the special attention of our readers the distinction so

strongly accentuated between individual Dissenters and the Dissenting ministry as a whole. The bishop's views of the Establishment demand fuller notice. For the present we content ourselves with expressing our hearty thanks to our Manchester brethren for the courage and courtesy with which they have met the bishop's criticisms.

---

### THE EDITOR'S LIBRARY TABLE.

THE present publishing season has been marked by an activity all the more striking because of the contrast with the somewhat remarkable paucity of great books during the last few years. At present there can be no such complaint. Messrs. Longman have given us portions of two or three works which are pretty sure to find a high place in our standard literature. Of Mr. Spencer Walpole's *History of England from 1815*, we have the concluding volumes. Without any claim to brilliancy of style, Mr. Spencer Walpole has, nevertheless, told the story of what may be regarded as, for practical purposes, the most important period of our history, and that which is least known, with considerable success. He is in sympathy with progress, but is fairly impartial in his judgments, as well as extremely careful in his statements of facts. It is a book with which every aspirant to public life should make himself thoroughly acquainted, if he desires to treat questions of the hour in an intelligent manner. Dr. Gardiner's *History of the Great Civil War*, of which we have the first volume, one-third of the whole, hardly needs a word of introduction. The writer has established his reputation for painstaking accuracy and thoroughness, while the judicial temper in which he treats all questions, lends a freshness to this new treatment of a subject which might have been thought all but worn out, and gives a distinct character to his work. Ewald's great book on the *History of Israel*, a contribution to biblical literature which will be valued for its extraordinary learning, boldness of thought, and ingenuity of suggestion, by those who feel constrained to dissent from many of its conclusions, is completed by the issue of the eighth volume. Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. have just issued two volumes by Mr. J. A. Symonds, entitled the *Catholic Renaissance in Italy*. It traverses the period which was treated by Ranke in his "History of the Popes," and was made familiar to English readers by one of the most brilliant and striking of Macaulay's articles. The magnificent picture of the Romish Church, and especially of its recovery from what once seemed to be a deadly blow inflicted upon it at the Reformation, with which that essay opens, can never be forgotten by any one who has ever felt its impressiveness. Mr. Symonds fills up the outline

which Macaulay has given. These volumes might have been properly entitled a "History of the Catholic Revival." Mr. Symonds does all his work well, and this book is no exception to the rule. A short monograph on Paul IV., published by Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., may with advantage be read in connection with it. Taken together, they give a very instructive and complete history of the Caraffas, one of the most remarkable families in the Papal history of the period. Among historical books, we have just to hand two volumes on *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, by Professor Baird. From the same house (Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co.) comes the last volumes of Duruy's "History of Rome"—a really great work.

The season is particularly rich in biography. Sir Francis H. Doyle's *Reminiscences and Opinions* (in reality his autobiography) are a little outside our period. They form a charming collection of gossip, not the less attractive because they reveal so fully the prejudices of the man. Sir Francis Doyle is a delightful old Tory, one who has an unconscious belief underlying all his estimates of men and events, that the masses were made for the classes, and that whoever interferes with an arrangement so much to the advantage of the latter, is an enemy both of God and man. The naïveté of some of his remarks, especially of his attacks upon Mr. Gladstone, and most of all his complaints about his own treatment, approaches the sublime. Even the keenest Radical can hardly be offended with opinions which, however contrary to his creed, are expressed with such perfect frankness and such absolute unconsciousness of the class selfishness by which they are inspired, that they lose all their sting. *Hayward's Letters* (John Murray) are a much more noteworthy contribution to literature. Mr. Hayward may not improperly be described a political and literary wire-puller. Few men had a larger acquaintance with the celebrities of his day, and his correspondence with them is brimful of interest. The prominence which Mr. Gladstone has in this as in all memoirs of the time is a striking testimony, not only to his many-sidedness, but to his singular attractiveness and geniality. What is more remarkable still is that while so many exchange confidences about him, there is nothing said by any one to his disparagement. Of course, everybody did not like him. Sir Francis Doyle has abandoned him in unconcealed alarm, Lord Palmerston was anxious to keep him muzzled at Oxford, Lord Shaftesbury can scarcely speak of him with patience. But this simply means that they did not agree with his politics, and time has proved that they were wrong and he was right. That, at least, is our judgment, from which others will dissent. It is, at all events, only a matter of opinion. What deserves to be emphasized is that while in these various memoirs we have the private thoughts of friend and foe about a great statesman who has been exposed to more attack than perhaps any man of his day, there is not a fact which tells to his discredit. Lord Shaftesbury's biography (Cassell and Co.) is fully discussed elsewhere. It is a book which is sure to be popular.

Dowden's life of Shelley (Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co.) has unique attraction and interest. It is a new study of a life and character full of contradictions and inconsistencies, with great power and rich promise marred by a lawlessness which resulted in sin and tragedy. Professor Dowden has not cleared up all the difficulties, not to say mysteries, of a melancholy story; but he has given all the information we are likely to have, and on it the final judgment of the world in relation to Shelley must be formed. A new life of Richard Baxter (William Kent and Co.) has a distinctive character, because it comes from a clergyman of Worcester, the Rev. J. Hamilton Davies; and a new life of John Wesley (Hodder and Stoughton) fills a gap which it is surprising should have been left so long vacant. It is the work of an appreciative outsider, and that is not what we have hitherto had.

In theology we have some books of considerable interest, though they can hardly be regarded as great works. If we were to make an exception it would be in favour of Dr. A. B. Bruce's volume on the *Miraculous Element in the Gospels* (Hodder and Stoughton), which is peculiarly timely, in view of the daring position taken in *The Kernel and the Husk* (Macmillan), by the author of "Philochristus" and "Onesimus," whose identity with Dr. Abbott, of the City of London School, is an "open secret." That book is a sign that the conflict is gathering around the person of our Lord, and it is a great advantage to have the argument put with such power and in such admirable temper as in Dr. Bruce's work. It may be that the pronounced character of Dr. Abbott's book may itself be a gain as showing the futility of unworthy concession, and the necessity for meeting firmly the questions which really involve the very existence of "Supernatural religion." To lose the living Christ is to lose everything. *Liberalism in Religion*, by Rev. W. Page Roberts (Smith, Elder, and Co.); *Christ in the Heart*, by Rev. Dr. Maclaren (Christian Commonwealth Office); *The Simplicity that is in Christ*, by Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon (Funk and Wallace), are the titles of striking volumes of sermons, to all of which we shall give fuller notice. The first two are specially suggestive and valuable as theological manifestoes, and will be considered by us as indicating the true limits of theological Liberalism. Several of the more important books named will be the subjects either of separate review in an early number, or of more extended notice next month, when we shall give a more complete summary of current literature than is possible now. Next month we shall commence the series of fuller notices which we intend to give regularly, and to make as complete as possible.

Among the literary incidents of the month the retirement of Mr. T. Wemyss Reid from the editorship of *The Leeds Mercury* is probably that which will have most interest for our readers. *The Leeds Mercury* has long been identified with Congregationalism, although, of course, in no sense a denominational paper. Mr. Wemyss Reid

himself is the son of one of our ministers who, after a long career of unselfish devotion and unrelaxing effort, retired from his pastorate at Newcastle-on-Tyne in a good old age, followed by the esteem and affection of men of all churches. His son is an accomplished *littérateur*. No one who knows anything of *The Leeds Mercury* can doubt the singular ability with which it has been conducted. We have sometimes disapproved its policy, but that did not lessen our admiration of the editorial skill manifest in every part. It would be an incalculable gain to Liberalism if the editors of the journals which represent it in the daily press of London would take a lesson from *The Leeds Mercury*, or other provincial journals, such as *The Liverpool Daily Post* or *Mercury*, or *The Manchester Guardian* or *Examiner*, which we never take up without a feeling of shame for the inferiority of London. Mr. Wemyss Reid will be a great loss to Liberal journalism, but we wish him all possible success in his new career as a manager in the great firm of Cassell and Co. He must have great business faculty as well as proved literary power, and these are the qualifications necessary for his new post.



## CURRENT LITERATURE.

### MAGAZINE VOLUMES.

THESE portly and handsome volumes are one of the leading features of our Christmas literature. We used to wonder how they all found a constituency, but since we heard that *The Century Magazine* alone circulates to the extent of a quarter of a million of subscribers, our surprise has ceased. Apparently our American cousins are ahead of us in magazine literature. We do not speak so much of the quality of the magazines as of the number of their readers. Whether books circulate as extensively we have no means of determining, but it would certainly seem as though there was a larger reading class to whom publishers can appeal with some confidence. We are improving, however, in the old country. Whether the multiplication of magazines like those before us is an unalloyed gain to literature may be open to question. Possibly they may interfere with the production of more permanent works, but it may be hoped that they help to form a taste for reading which afterwards seeks gratification in more solid literature. Be this as it may, the magazines themselves are remarkable both for the literary power and the artistic taste expended upon them, and it is hardly an exaggeration to describe them as marvels of cheapness. Here we are indebted to healthy competition for the maintenance, or rather the advance, of the high average which they have attained in previous years. The great firm of Cassell and Co., whose enterprise and energy in the department of literature for the people cannot be too highly commended, Isbister and Co., the representatives of the

firm which by starting *Good Words* really inaugurated a revolution in the magazine world, and the Religious Tract Society, send us two volumes each. Perhaps they may be regarded as rivals, but their rivalry is of a friendly character, and though it may not be very easy to fix the differentiating point, yet each has a certain individuality of its own, and all deserve a hearty welcome.

It seems to be accepted as an established point that every one of these magazines must have its own serial stories. Whether it would be possible for a magazine to live without thus catering for the widespread love of fiction it is hard to say. But it certainly seems as though no publisher would make the venture, and after all publishers are likely to be the best judges of the popular demand. In *Good Words* the services of that comparatively new and promising writer, Miss Linskill, and that established popular favourite, George Manville Fenn, have been engaged, and both of them have given us stories of considerable merit. The writers in *The Sunday Magazine* are hardly so well known, but in "Dinah Mite" "Brenda" gives us a very touching story of London poverty, its sorrows and its struggles; one calculated to develop the sympathy and feed the hope of true, loving Christian hearts. The "Living of Langleys" is interesting to us as an indirect illustration of the evils of the wretched system of purchase in the Church, though probably that was the last thought in the writer's mind. In *Cassell's Family Magazine*, though the serial story is preserved, and as much may be said for *The Quiver*, it hardly assumes the same prominent position. But in both the one and the other there is an ample supply of interesting fiction which is always high in its tone and healthy in its tenderness. In *The Leisure Hour* Mrs. Oliphant is one of the writers of fiction, and her new story of "A Poor Gentleman" shows that this veteran favourite has lost none of her old skill. Of course, in addition to the principal tales, there is a great number of smaller stories and sketches which serve to impart life and variety to these books.

We are by no means severe in this matter of fiction. It would be simply absurd to enter into any crusade against it, especially when the stories are of the high character which is always maintained in these publications. We should go even further, and recognize the value of fiction not only as a relief to wearied brains, but as an attractive medium for the elucidation of truth and the enforcement of great principles. But the question will sometimes occur as to the extent to which readers, and especially young readers, treat all the more serious contents of the magazine as mere padding. Without taking any pessimist view on this point, we cannot deny that there is ground for such an apprehension. But at the same time it must in all fairness be said, that their editors have spared no pains to supply matter which cannot be thus contemptuously described and lightly dismissed. In every one of these magazines there are numerous papers full of valuable information on points of general interest, and generally put in an attractive

form. *The Sunday at Home*, for example, has biographies, papers on hymnology, and a series of sketches from the history of the modern Jews which are both instructive and interesting. *Cassell's Family Magazine* adapts itself to every phase of domestic life. The "Gatherer" is simply a marvellous miscellany of information of all kinds. In another department the "Family Doctor" gives hints which ought to be of incalculable value. For example, we turn to a paper on the voice, and how to keep it in health, and find a number of judicious practical hints which cannot fail to be of service. *The Quiver* is perhaps more religious in its character, and among its features we may notice its "Bible Class," its short arrows, and not least its papers on the New Testament, and, as one of its distinctive features, its hymn tunes, many of which are of a very high order. By the way, one of the difficulties in the way of our new hymnals will arise out of the production of good new tunes which organists and choirs will hardly be disposed entirely to ignore. The "Biblical Papers" and "Sunday Evenings with Children" are among the best features of *The Sunday Magazine*. The latter are somewhat unequal in merit, but all of them, even those which may be regarded as least effective, are admirable examples of what these home series for children ought to be. In *Good Words* we select for special notice the papers on the Templars, by Froude, the short biographies of words by Professor Max Müller, and the entire series of the social and philanthropic papers. All these volumes are profusely illustrated, and though, as might be expected, they are very diversified in merit, there are certainly among them many of a distinctly high class. Among the frontispieces we should certainly give the palm to the extremely beautiful figure of a girl in *Cassell's Family Magazine*. Those of *The Leisure Hour* ("What will he become?") and *The Sunday at Home* ("Youth and Age"), a drawing from Birket Foster, come next in order of merit.

*The Magazine of Art* (Cassell and Co.) occupies a distinct and unique position. It must be regarded as one of the artistic educators of the people, and one of the difficulties of its conductors must be that they have to satisfy a taste whose demands they are themselves continually enlarging. It is only fair to say that they are fully equal to the requirements which are made of them. We have carefully noted the magazine for some years past, and have marked a steady advance which is fully maintained in the present volume. In our judgment it is even superior to any of its predecessors. One of the conspicuous features in it is the extraordinary degree of excellence to which it has carried wood engravings, many of the specimens in which possess the beauty of outline and clearness of detail which we have been accustomed to associate with line engravings. Among the more striking contents of the volume are "Art in Syria and Egypt and Greece," and the series entitled "Poems and Pictures."

*Little Folks*. A Magazine for the Young. (Cassell and Co.). What Messrs. Cassell do for the drawing-room in *The Family Maga-*



zine, they do for the nursery by *Little Folks*. The ingenuity here expended for the purpose of interesting children is surprising, and must be successful. No one, indeed, who has seen a child with one of the capital volumes of this series in his hands, can entertain a doubt that the efforts of publisher and editor are fully appreciated by those for whom they are designed. And if this were not sufficient, the publishers have taken advantage of the Queen's Jubilee celebration to institute a system of prize competitions. We are not ourselves very fond of this kind of stimulus to circulation; but if it is permissible anywhere, it certainly is in the case of children. The offers in connection with *Little Folks* are sufficiently attractive.

#### BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.

*In Letters of Flame: a Tale of the Waldenses.* By C. L. MATÉAUX. (Cassell and Co.) The writer of this capital story has shown judgment both in the selection of his topic and in the choice of a title sure to attract the attention of the young. We know no more effectual way of awakening in the minds of our young people sympathy with our great Protestant principles than to make them familiar with the heroism that has been displayed on their behalf. The narrative of the Waldenses yields abundant materials, and they are here woven into a story full of tragic and yet tender interest. It gives a vivid and striking picture of the pains and penalties to which these noble people were subjected by the Papacy. The plot of the story is slight, but it is skilfully worked out. Bazile, the hero, is a Reformé, who, having been rescued by a Berg when a child, cherished the lofty ambition of becoming the William Tell who is to deliver his oppressed and persecuted countrymen. With this end in view, he leaves his home in the mountains and comes to Paris to study at the university. While here he becomes enamoured of Rosalie, the heroine, whom he saves from drowning in the Seine, and whom he ultimately marries, concealing from her his religious views and his patriotic designs. A visit from his old friend the Berg, however, compelled him to divulge to his wife the secret which he had kept from her so long. The disclosure led to a parting, Bazileo returning with the Berg to carry on an aggressive paper warfare on behalf of the Vaudois. During his absence his wife becomes herself a Vaudois and an outcast, and joins her husband just in time to warn him of the danger which threatened him, and to flee with him to a place of safety.—*Through Trial to Triumph; or, The Royal Way.* By MADELINE BONAVIA HUNT. (Cassell and Co.) The title of this book explains its purpose and general drift. It is designed to illustrate and enforce the old saying, that the way to shining crown lies by weeping cross. It is a story of three girls who tried to solve the important problem presented in the opening chapter, "What are we girls to do with our lives?" In the varying experiences of two of them especially, viz., Margaret and

Muriel (for the story of Hazel occupies a very small part of the volume), we see in what different ways the problem may be solved, and with what different results. Margaret, a strong, self-reliant, practical Christian, filled with the love of humanity, seeks to solve it by devoting herself to the poor in one of the slums of London; while Muriel, who is a more yielding and dependent sort of character, endeavours to work it out by marrying a village doctor. One great lesson taught by the story of the latter is that marriage can only be happy where there is both mutual esteem and mutual love.—*Strong to Suffer: a Story of the Jews*. By E. WYNNE. (Cassell and Co.) The subject of this book is the persecution to which the Jews were subjected by the Emperor Hadrian, when he visited the Holy City and issued a terrible edict, forbidding men to read the law or to speak it, or to dedicate their children to their God, or to keep holy the day of rest that He had appointed; the penalty of disobedience being death. How bravely and patiently they suffered and outlived this persecution is strikingly shown in the pages of this book. Their sufferings caused them to lend a willing ear to Bar-Chocab, and a victory gained at Ekron in a sudden assault upon the citadel led them to salute him as the messiah. The rest of the book is occupied with an account of the rising of the Jews under the false messiah and the sufferings consequent upon it. Altogether it gives a graphic description of the history of the time.—*With Wolfe in Canada; or, the Winning of a Continent*. By G. A. HENTY. (Blackie and Son.) This is something more than a mere story. Mr. Henty, than whom no one understands better how to cater for boys, has here united instruction with entertainment. In this book he has done for an interesting episode in Canadian history what he did in a former work for the story of our Indian Empire. The subject of his present story is one which cannot fail to be attractive to boy readers, while the easy and flowing style in which the book is written gives it an additional charm. Apart altogether from its merits as a story (and there is a thread of fiction running through the whole), it has a special value as giving a clear, succinct, and thoroughly trustworthy account of the events connected with the struggle between the English and the French waged on the American continent, which ended in the death of Wolfe on the victory of our own countrymen. Any boy who desires to become acquainted with the details of that important struggle "on the issues of which," as Mr. Henty observes, depended not only the destiny of Canada, but of the whole of North America, and to a large extent that of the two mother countries," cannot do better than read this book, in which he will find the fullest information on the subject imparted in a most delightful and agreeable form.—*Devon Boys: a Tale of the North Shore*. By GEORGE MANVILLE FENN. (Blackie and Son.) This is a stirring and spirited story of life on the Devonshire coast. Mr. Fenn has not found it necessary to go to foreign lands in search of adventures. On the north shore of Devonshire he has found abundant material for a thoroughly lively, not to say

sensational, story. Certainly the boys who read it will not be able to complain that there is in it any lack of movement and go. If the scenes and surroundings are those of home, the incidents recorded in it are anything but tame or homely in their character. The boys are fine manly fellows, with that strong spice of adventure which residence on a sea coast not unfrequently engenders. How they amused themselves in their holidays, with such harmless and innocent sports as blasting rocks, building furnaces for smelting, diving with smugglers, having perilous swims, discovering a silver mine, as well as in preparing for the landing of the French and fighting them afterwards, we leave to our readers to find out for themselves. The book is thoroughly wholesome in its tone and tendency, and may be heartily recommended as a gift-book.—*Down the Snow-stairs; or, From Good-night to Good-morning.* By ALICE CORKRAN. (Blackie and Son.) A beautiful Christmas story for young children. The writer has a strong vein of fancy, and, what is more, she has a true sympathy with children.—*Ronald Bannerman's Boyhood.* By GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D. New Edition. (Blackie and Son.) Dr. Macdonald's books for young people differ *toto cælo* from the ordinary run of such works. They have on them a stamp of originality which distinguishes them from the works of other writers for boys. While they are destitute of those stirring adventures which form such a prominent feature in most boys' books, they are by no means tame or commonplace; and if they deal more with the events of ordinary and everyday life in the home and in the school, they deal with them in such a way as to give them a peculiar meaning and charm. Moreover, Dr. Macdonald generally infuses into his stories an element of romance which gives to them a strange and weirdlike beauty, and so imparts to them a singular fascination for all lovers of that which is marvellous and mysterious. This element is not wanting in "Ronald Bannerman's Boyhood." It is a simple and yet beautiful story of the child-life of a Scottish boy, and which shows that sympathy with children which is so marked a characteristic of his writings.—*At the Back of the North Wind.* By GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D. (Blackie and Son.) This is a well-known book of Dr. George Macdonald's. It was popular when it was first written, and we are glad to see it in this new edition, the issue of which shows that it still retains its hold on the minds of those for whom it was intended.—*Not Thrown Away, but Given; or, the Story of Marion's Hero.* By MRS. G. S. REANEY. (T. Nelson and Sons.) The title of this book refers to the hero. Conrad Tracey is a clever young Christian, who, being filled with the spirit of earnestness and enthusiasm for humanity, refuses the offer of a comfortable living in the Established Church in order that he may devote himself to philanthropic and evangelistic work in the East End of London. Some one said that he was throwing his life away by so doing; but in the opinion of the writer (and we take it that in this her readers will agree with her), he was

not throwing it away, but giving it. The story is well told, and the lessons inculcated by it are exceedingly timely and useful.—*Changed Scenes; or, the Castle and the Cottage.* By Lady HOPE. (T. Nelson and Sons.) Though the scenes in this story are changed two or three times, the story itself is a very slight one, and the incidents are few. But the allegories which are introduced into it are both striking and beautiful.—*Jack Hooper: His Adventures at Sea and in South Africa.* By VERNEY LOVETT CAMERON, C.B., D.C.L. (T. Nelson and Sons.) This is a thorough boys' book. It is full of varied and exciting adventures related in a bright and cheery style which is sure to be very fascinating to youthful readers. It is written by one who has himself been an eye-witness of the scenes and incidents which he describes, and therefore it has all the vividness and freshness which belong to an account of personal experience and observation, Commander Cameron having crossed Tropical Africa from East to West. "In this book for boys" (he says) "I have endeavoured to give a sketch of times which are, though in point of years but yesterday, fading out of the memory of men. Where the giraffe and gnu grazed, the flocks of the farmer find sustenance; and even the dreaded Kalahan desert is being shorn of its terrors, and at no distant time may be occupied by squatters, who in wealth and property will rival those of Australia." The stirring accounts which the writer gives of encounters with lions, lionesses, antelopes, ostriches, gnus, rhinoceroses, elephants, buffaloes, giraffes, and hippopotamuses are sure to be attractive to boys with a love of adventure. It has, moreover, a special interest arising from the fact that it relates to a country of which, on account of its connection with the British Empire, the boys of England may naturally desire to know something more than the bare details to be found in their school geographies.

---

Epochs of Church History. *History of the Reformation in England.* By GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A. *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century.* By JOHN HENRY OVERTON. *The English Church in other Lands, or the Spiritual Expansion of England.* By Rev. W. H. TUCKER, M.A. (Longmans, Green, & Co.) These three little books form part of a series corresponding to those which are devoted to ancient and modern history. The names of the authors are a sufficient guarantee for an efficient treatment. More competent men could not easily have been secured for their respective tasks. Mr. Parry has earned a high position as the historian of the Anglican Church. Mr. Overton has specially distinguished himself in connection with the story of the eighteenth century, first by the elaborate work on the Church History of the periods, in which he was collaborateur with Mr. Abbey, which is a standard work in its own department, and subsequently by his charming volume of sketches from the Church life of the time. As Secretary of the Propagation Society, Mr. Tucker has an inti-

mate acquaintance with what he calls the spiritual expansion of England which is unrivalled. Of course all these writers look at their respective subjects from an Anglican standpoint, and however anxious they are to be impartial, it is simply impossible that their views should not be affected by their predilections and associations. Their very position as clergymen in the Anglican Church itself implies that they have formed their own distinct views on most points of controversy, and those views of course are not in harmony with those which Nonconformists are accustomed to take. But of this we as Nonconformists have no right to complain. What we have to do is, to take care that our conceptions be fully presented on the opposite side. In other words, it is of primary importance for our own future in this country that we devote more care and thought to our historic literature. Mr. Perry is by no means so extreme a man as Mr. Blunt. Mr. Blunt treats Wycliffe, the Lollards, Tyndale, and even Latimer, as constituting an Anti-Church party, and distinctly separates the English Reformation from any connection with them. Canon Perry, on the contrary, places their influence in the forefront among the producing causes of the Reformation. Still, of course, he is desirous to insist on the continuity of the Anglican Church through the whole, and goes so far as to assert that the legislation of the Reformation Parliament was not altogether of a novel character, but only the revival of that which for somewhat more than a century during the troubles and weakness of the Wars of the Roses had been in abeyance. The view is one which must be accepted with considerable qualifications which would require to be more fully stated and more carefully argued than is possible to us here. As much might be said in general of the history as it proceeds, and, in fact, in order to deal with it, it would be almost necessary to adopt a running comment. But while unable to accept all Canon Perry's views, we have the greater pleasure in bearing testimony to the spirit of moderation and fairness in which the book is written. We are especially struck with this in his judgments of individual character. Mr. Overton's story of the Evangelical Revival is no doubt open to a similar line of observation. But the subject of which he treats has fewer points in it of a controversial character, and therefore there is less reason for any qualification in the high estimate which we have formed of this little book. The work is carefully and sympathetically done, and while the story is admirably told, the author's observations are often very striking. He quotes Tyndale on his continuation of Rapiu, that at the time Whitefield was regarded as the most prominent character amongst the Methodists. His own account of the two men sufficiently explains the difference between the estimate formed at the time and that which history has adopted. Wesley, as we all know, was a great administrator. Whitefield stands forth, as Mr. Overton shows, as the orator of the movement. "Whitefield was simply a guileless, self-denying, but ill-trained and

very injudicious, enthusiast in the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth century's acceptance of that time. To criticize him would be like criticizing the song of the skylark; for the one is hardly more careless than the other what the world might say." Charles Wesley's place in the movement seems to us to be admirably described. His remarkable gift of sacred song is considered by Mr. Overton not only to have given light and sweetness to the worship of those vast congregations which assembled to hear the new lights, but supplied to a great extent the place of a liturgy and a creed. More people expressed their hopes, their fears, their beliefs in the language of Charles Wesley's hymns than in that of John Wesley's sermons. Mr. Overton is perfectly right in his view of the effect of the Evangelical Revival upon the Dissenting Churches. They had shared in the general paralysis which had fallen upon religious life in the century, and it is probably true that the Dissenting interest, as it was called, was never at a lower ebb than when the revival came to give it new life. There is not a more suggestive passage in the book than that in which Mr. Overton traces the relations between the old Evangelicals and the Dissenters. As he shows, the Evangelicals of that day did not hold what are now called Church principles, and so the Revival naturally tended to the increase of the Dissenting Churches. Of course this suggests the change which has passed upon the Evangelical party since that day. Its great anxiety, at present seems to be to make it clear that they are Churchmen, and in doing this they are sacrificing the elements of their own real strength. We must content ourselves with a general commendation of Mr. Tucker's most interesting account of the work of the Anglican Church in foreign countries. We cannot regard it as answering to the description of the spiritual expansion of England. If that were to be made complete, it must include a much broader survey of the work done by British Christianity.

*The Expositor.* Third Series. Vol. IV. Edited by the Rev. W. R. NICOL. (Hodder and Stoughton.) Among the features of this volume, we may note Bishop Alexander's "Gleanings from St. Peter's Harvest-field." The three articles which are thus grouped together exhibit that delicacy of touch, that spiritual insight, and that chastened eloquence which are so characteristic of one of the ablest divines of the day. Professor Cheyne is a frequent contributor, and his two papers on the "Life and Work of Ewald" are among the most valuable articles in the volume. Dr. Maclaren's "Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians" fully maintains its reputation even if it does not actually rise above it. We notice especially the chapter on "Slaying Self," and the other on "The Garments of the Renewed Soul," as marked by singular freshness and force. Professor Kirkpatrick's criticism on the "Revised Version of the Old Testament" is exceedingly valuable. The frontispiece to the volume is a portrait of the Bishop of Durham,

than whom no one has a better title to occupy such a position. Dr. Sanday's sketch of him is a singularly interesting paper, and is an admirable specimen of the way in which high admiration may be combined with perfect frankness of criticism. It is extremely refreshing to find the way in which Dean Stanley's claims to Biblical criticism are dealt with. His notes on Corinthians are described as "a very slipshod performance," and his reply to Dr. Lightfoot's strictures upon them spoken of as "a piece of the fly-away criticism which came naturally to his facile and easy pen."

*The Legendary History of the Cross.* With Introduction by JOHN ASHTON. Preface by S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. (T. Fisher Unwin.) This is a thoroughly æsthetic work. Paper, typography, illustrations, are all in one style, and combine to produce a book which must have rare attractions for all lovers of the quaint and the artistic. Of course it is pre-eminently a book for the season. In the preface, for which we are indebted to Mr. Baring-Gould, we are told that "our favourite Christmas tree has been taken up out of Paganism and rooted in Christian soil, where it flourishes to the annual delight of thousands of children." The original was sacred to Odin, was "Yggdrasill, the world tree, whose roots extended to hell, and whose branches spread to heaven." The story is, in fact, the companion of the story of the Holy Grail, as the "Grail cup became the chalice of the blood of Christ, the tree of Odin became the Cross of Calvary." The legendary history is written by Mr. John Ashton, who has collected here a multitude of most curious particulars. Not the least curious is his account of the pieces of the Holy Cross, which are found scattered over various parts of the Roman Catholic world. There is not a large proportion of these in this country the total amounting to 30,516 cubic millimetres out of 3,941,975. No less than twenty-nine towns claim the possession of thirty-two nails, all differing in form. The story, however curious, is sufficiently sad as an illustration of the tendency of the human mind to superstition. It serves only as an introduction to the extraordinary series of sixty-four woodcuts from Veldener's Dutch book, published 1483. Alike for its typography and its quaint illustrations, the book is both curious and valuable. It is a remarkable specimen of the high point to which art has been carried.

*Jerusalem, Bethany, and Bethlehem.* By J. L. PORTER, D.D., LL.D. (T. Nelson and Sons.) This is one of the most handsome and attractive books of the season. A more competent man for its preparation could not have been found. Dr. Porter has himself resided for years in the Holy Land, and has made himself familiar with all its scenes. While therefore he has fully availed himself of the researches of others, he writes from a very extensive observation of his own. As the result he has given us a volume which is an admirable guide and handbook to the whole of the topography of these sacred places, embodying all the

results of the latest researches of the Palestine Exploration Society. But the glory of the book, after all, is in its magnificent illustrations. It has been well said by Dr. Thomson, that for the full understanding of any work on Palestine, illustrations, pictorial as well as textual, are absolutely essential. This volume abundantly answers the requirement. The illustrations are in most cases fine works of art. The clearness of the engraving is very striking, and adds greatly to the value of these sketches. A more suitable or welcome Christmas present could not well be found.

*Fortune's Buffets and Rewards.* By E. D. PRIMROSE. In Three Vols. (T. Fisher Unwin.) Mr. Primrose's name is a new one to us, and we suppose that he is a new writer. If this be his first work, as seems probable, it is one of considerable promise. The plot is not badly conceived, and though there are some points of weakness in the elaboration of it, especially in the part which relates to the mystery surrounding the hero's home, and perhaps in the closing scenes of John Glegg's career, yet, taking it as a whole, it must be pronounced as an effective story. But it is in the pictures of Scotch life, and in the delineation of Scotch character, that the principal charm lies. Scotland has an individuality which, with their insular or rather provincial conceit, Englishmen have not cared to study, and which certainly they do not understand. Possibly this very ignorance may make these sketches of university and social life in Edinburgh, varied with occasional glimpses of the country farmstead and manse, all the more attractive. They are certainly done with great cleverness by one who has enough discrimination to see the weak and the humorous side, but who never descends to be a caricaturist or unkind satirist. Were we not restrained by the inexorable limits of space, we could quote many passages not unworthy of a place in Dean Ramsay's reminiscences. The minister's man, for example, is a genuine product of the soil, and is always amusing. Some of his own sayings and those which he repeats are extremely racy and characteristic. Mr. Primrose, however, clearly intends to point a moral; and though there is not a page of sermonizing from beginning to end, the impression left by the book cannot but be salutary. The schemer, who, in the evil sense of the phrase, is all things to all men, and prospers for a time in dint of sheer impudence, is admirably contrasted with the simple-minded, true-hearted, and industrious youth who honestly endeavours to do his duty. Mr. Primrose is more successful in the portraiture of character and manners than in the weaving of a story; but, as a whole, his book deserves a word of hearty praise.

---

*The February Number will contain the first Review of the Books of the Season.*



